

SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA



A

LETTER

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

WILLIAM WICKHAM,

CHIEF SECRETARY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE

LORD LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND,

AND ONE OF HIS MAJESTY'S MOST HONOURABLE
PRIVY COUNCIL, &c. &c.

ON THE SUBJECT OF MR. SCULLY'S ADVICE.

TO HIS

CATHOLIC BRETHERN.

BY A YEOMAN.

FIFTH EDITION.

*Quid facies odio, sic ubi amore nocet ?
Si lædis quod amas, hostem sapienter amabis :
Me precor, ut serves, perdere velle velis.*

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY AND FOR R. E. MERCIER,
31, ANGLESEA-STREET

1803.

“ In what I shall say, I beg of you to consider me, as observing solely on the Work ; and not upon the Author.”

AN IRISH LOYALIST.

A LETTER, &c.

DEAR SIR,

IF we are to estimate the merit of a work, by its tendency to promote the end for which it was designed, and that the object of Mr. Scully was to animate the loyalty of his fellow subjects, I doubt whether I have ever met a worse production, than that which he has lately offered to the public. Indeed, if his wish had been to damp that ardour which he pretended to excite, then his pages might be well calculated to attain their purposes; and by becoming mischievous, would cease to be contemptible. To deny them this latter praise, would be a degree of candour, to which, if we are to search his paragraphs for his principles, a censorious critic might alledge that he had no title. But I am content to wave all enquiry as to motive; and adopting the hypothesis, that this pamphlet was well intended, shall examine whether those intentions have been carried happily into effect. In the meantime, let it not be supposed that I detract from the character, public or private, of Mr. Scully. I have never heard any thing that could war-

rant a suspicion of his loyalty; nor unless his own writings should be thought to tend this way, have I ever read any thing that could lead justifiably to its impeachment. What he has himself avowed, I cannot slander him by repeating; and I shall, for argument, ascribe to him the most laudable designs.

But why is my letter directed as it is? In the first place I do *not* write to Mr. Scully, because our views of public matters are so widely different, that discussion between us would be vain and ineffectual. We have few ideas in common, on the subjects which he treats. Secondly, I take the liberty of addressing you, because the field of enquiry to which his doctrines lead, appears of sufficient importance to merit your attention.

One of a writer's first tasks, is the selection of his topics: and in making a judicious choice, much ability may be shewn. But this selection may be so extravagantly imprudent, as not only to be unaccountable on the score of want of skill, but to induce a doubt, whether the author's professed object was that he really had in view. For example, if undertaking to argue in favour of the Revolution, I should begin by inculcating the doctrine of passive obedience, the merit of James's efforts to introduce Popery into his kingdoms, and the indefeasible nature of his hereditary right, it is not impossible that my sincerity might be called in question; and those who admitted it, must confess that my topics were ill chosen.

If

If the allegiance of subjects is likely to be excited, by an exaggerated and angry statement of every real or fancied grievance, of which they ever have complained, Mr. Scully's work (or, to adopt his own elegant metaphor, his bellows*) will blow the loyalty of Ireland to a flame. If by fomenting jealousies we produce harmony, his sheets are admirably calculated to promote cordial co-operation. If (inadvertently) to extenuate the guilt of rebellion, and speak of Rebels with ostentatious respect, be to discourage treason, —then this pamphlet must banish disaffection from the country. If by taking away the check of fear, we remove a temptation to insurrection, then the contemptuous notice which is taken of the paucity of Protestants, in page 56, cannot fail of producing the most salutary effects. But alas! these arguments are thrown away on me! and I am glad to know that the Catholics have better reasons for being determined to “repel invasion,” † and “defend their native soil,” ‡ than any which have been furnished by Mr. Scully's pen. If it were otherwise, I should not much confide in their allegiance.

But let me now proceed to consider his topics, feriatim: if, indeed, the undertaking be not rendered superfluous, by the sensible and constitutional remonstrances of *an Irish Loyalist*.

Mr.

* Page 96.

† Title page.

‡ Page 4.

Mr. Scully begins by laying no very constitutional foundation, in a statement of total indifference to the interests of *France or England*; farther than as those countries affect our prosperity and independence*.

This was the avowed doctrine of Mr. Arthur O'Connor: one of those, of whose moral and intellectual qualities, Mr. Scully will not speak, but with respect †.

He, in an address to the Freeholders of Antrim, disclaimed, as does this work, the slightest solicitude about England, except as the ally of this country, and insisted on our right of option, between her alliance and that of France. This sentiment he repeated in a letter to Lord Castlereagh; which, if Mr. Scully's rigid loyalty permitted his looking into such publications, he would find among the numbers of *the Press*. These doctrines were then unconstitutional in a high and dangerous degree; as applied to a country, to whose crown that of Ireland was inseparably annexed. But what are they now,—when, by their legislative incorporation, these two islands form one kingdom? Such positions are now most pernicious, or most absurd. If the passage on which I am animadverting be harmless, then is it equivalent to a wise assurance, that the author is no farther solicitous about Munster, than as its interests affect those of the other provinces of Ireland. As to the interests of England affecting

* Page 4.

† Page 25.

fecting the *independence of Ireland*, this is nonsense. The independence of this country (have patience) is at an end. The term involves the idea of a *distinctness* now abolished. Our independence of Great Britain is exchanged, not for subjection to, but Union with that realm.

Mr. Scully proceeds next to an *animating* suggestion of the “privations, restraints, and grievances,” * of his Catholic Brethren. The effect of these gravamina is stated in the next page; where he congratulates his countrymen on their “resurrection to prosperity,” and enjoyment of “a rank, the most enviable and truly splendid, which the annals of history present.” Grievances, of which these are the fruits, must be confessed to be of a most peculiar nature. I have heard of “Splendid Misery:” but it was the title of a romance.

The adviser then makes his attack upon the *French*. Not being in their secrets, as but for his loyalty he might appear to be, I cannot say whether our invaders may consist of the descriptions which he has enumerated, or whether the command of the expedition is to be given to Massena †. I therefore come at once to the enquiry which he proposes, *viz.* whether the Catholics should act “with them, or against them ‡?” This question, whether the King’s Subjects ought to adhere to his enemies,—he undertakes dispassionately and

* Page 6.

† Page 8.

‡ Page 9.

and gravely to discuss: converting his pamphlet into an auxiliary of the gallows; and a rider upon the statutes of treason. His object must be confessed to be as unique, as the *grievously prosperous* situation of his flock.

Even though loyalty were wanting, (which I do not assert to be the case here,) his fears would dissuade an author from maintaining the propriety of an Irish subject's acting with the French. He would feel obliged to support, with Mr. Scully, the reverse. But if he wanted the warm sentiment of allegiance in his heart, his support would be feeble, and his arguments inconclusive: or if he were a cunning and disaffected man, he would contrive that his reasoning should disprove his proposition; and though he might persuade the Catholics to "act *with vigour*, and in *concert* *" he would not secure their energies to their King. Besides, though such a writer were in earnest in rejecting the assistance of Bonaparte, this might be his mere difference in opinion as to *means*, from those in whose treasonable *purposes* he agreed: and whether this was the case, must be inferred from the context, and general tenor of his work. In such a rejection of French aid, he would, (if we may trust the provisional proclamation,) be found to concur with the late Mr. Robert Emmett; of whose "moral qualities," it is beside my purpose or inclination

inclination, (for *I* do not wish “to enlarge on the demerits of the departed,”*)—“to speak with any disrespect:” but of whose steady allegiance, some doubts may be entertained. From the charge of loyalty so defective, or views so indirect, the respectable character of Mr. Scully must exempt him. But a Censor, who chose to judge him rather by his writings, than by his reputation, might be hastily led to impute them to him: nor would his indifference as to the success, or discomfiture of the King’s forces †, or his parallel between the butcheries of Wexford, and our victory at Ballinamuck ‡, at all tend to rescue him from such an imputation. His readers would suspect the principles of that man, who compared the conduct of the viceroy at this latter place, with the rebel atrocities, which excluded their perpetrators from the act of amnesty, passed under his administration ||.

But Mr Scully recommends to the Catholics to keep *the little* which they have §; (*viz.* great prosperity, and enviably splendid rank;) and to repel the French, at the point of their bayonets, *and their pikes* ¶. Alas! I like not such recognitions of the legitimacy of these latter. I become suspicious, on the mention of such *instrumens de dommage*; and should tremble to trust my country to the protection

C

of

* Page 55.

† Page 10.

‡ Ibid.

|| Lord Cornwallis’s. The commission of murder, (as on the Bridge of Wexford,) excludes from the benefit of this act.

§ Page 11.

¶ Ibid.

of weapons, yet reeking with the blood of the mild and virtuous Lord Kilwarden.—I should fear that those Javelin Men might not be so zealous against a *French*, as Mr. Scully *boasts* their forefathers to have been, against a *Dutch* Invader.

“ A Dutch Invader, and his hired battalions,” resisted by the “ loyal ancestors” of Mr. Scully, “ fighting for their hereditary king*.” This is the author’s picture of that glorious Revolution, under which the house of Brunswick is seated on the throne. Our Deliverer, whose assent ratified the Bill of Rights,—is vilified with the epithet of Dutch invader; and his brave followers are degraded into mercenary battalions: while that jacobitism, for which (in 1745,) thousands justly perished on the scaffold, and in the field, is dignified with the name of loyalty; and the “ glorious terms of its capitulation” † are dwelt on with delight. Is this the allegiance of a man who understands the principles of our constitution? Is this encouragement to defend the Protestant succession of the house of Hanover.——whose grand and illustrious title-deed is the Revolution?

But why is French assistance to be rejected? On account of our connexion with Great Britain? No. The writer feels no solicitude about England; except as her interests may happen to affect our own. Because to accept French
aid

* Page 12.

† At Limerick, page 13.

aid would be to violate our allegiance? No. It is because they *unkindly* neglected “to make any serious attempts for the restoration of king James: because the descent of *Tburot* and his handful of men, was a petty and undecisive proceeding: because *Hoche* had not the courage to effect a landing in 1796; and because *Humbert* did not obtain quarter for those rebels, whom Mr. Scully calls “his hapless countrymen,” at Ballinamuck;* but exposed the traitors to military execution. The effect of this exposure, the Catholic adviser deploras as follows: “the dishonoured fellows saw, with unconcern, almost every man of these poor Irish, † *butchered* before their eyes. I have been on the field of *massacre*; and was shewn pits, into which heaps of Irish carcases were thrown, without the ordinary rites of interment.” If this description evinces as much attachment to the constitution, as it displays tenderness for the rebel bands, it is indeed *omni exceptione major*; and he would be a punctilious critic, who could find room for objection.

“Such is the protection of the French:” ‡ and therefore it is, that they are not to be relied on. If indeed they had endeavoured to re-establish James,—if they had sent a more effectual squadron to Carrickfergus.—if they had boldly landed at Bantry, in 1796,—or if Humbert had secured quarter for “those brave allies,
“whom

* Pages 13. 14. 16. 17.

† *i. e.* The Traitors.

‡ Page 17.

“ whom he treacherously betrayed to untimely
 “ graves *”, the case would be widely different. Here, IF would lose its pacific character; and instead of being a *peace maker*, might become a fomenter of rebellion. A reader who, unacquainted with the loyal principles of Mr. Scully, passed cursorily over the pages which we have been criticising, might conclude that if the objections stated to French alliance were either frivolous, or done away, the arguments built upon them, and urged against acting with that nation, would be overturned. He might consider those arguments as conveying, less the sentiments of a determined foe, than the angry jealousies of a slighted, but reconcileable adherent; and as better calculated to induce the French to give sufficient security against a repetition of the like neglects, than to incite the Irish to a loyal and vigorous resistance.

One ground of argument against acting with the French, I had nearly forgotten: the *impoliteness* of which their Generals were guilty, at the Dean of Ardagh's †. This objection, I am satisfied, will have great weight with the cultivated and polished pikemen ‡, to whom it is addressed: persons whom Humbert mistook for “ scoundrels;” § but whom Mr. Scully, though they be blemished with the venial fault called treason, represents as his brave and injured countrymen: clés of those, whose talents and morals he respects; || yet who, spite
 of

* Pages 16. 17.
 § Page 17.

† Page 19.
 ‡ Page 25

‡ Page 11.

of their great merits, and excellent education, were butchered by their cruel governors, after having been betrayed by their perfidious allies.* Thus even more unfortunate than their venerated preceptors; whose want of some kind of "pension," we so commiserate, † that such as return from France, may be certain of suspension.

But I may be said to have forgotten another objection to French alliance. I have hitherto omitted to notice it: But it has not escaped my observation; nor do I mean to defraud the author of it's just praise. It accords better with Mr. Scully's respectable character, than with his (in my eyes) most objectionable tract; and I have but separated it from the pollutions in which it was immersed, lest their impure contact should defile my approbation. I advert to that syllabus of Consular interposition, and spirited epitome of "the farce of French Deliverance," ‡ which may be found between pages 31 and 46.

I am disposed to exclaim, *cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!* while I read this part of his work: and its incongruity with the rest, at once gratifies and annoys me. I am pleased to find opinions, which appear to me of a blacker dye, qualified and diluted by sentiments which I approve: but am sorry to perceive this antigallican effusion, debased by the alloy of doctrines more impure. Nay some of these,

* Pages 16 and 17.

† Their reception (in France) has been so cold, that you would really pity their feelings: they are allowed no pension. Page 27.

‡ Page 37.

these, incorporated with it, detract considerably from its title to our praise. Such is that false parallel, which the *Irish Loyalist** has justly reprehended, between the agrarian partition which would be made by Bonaparte, and the division of Irish lands in the days of the commonwealth. If the comparison has any meaning, (and I fear it has.) its tendency is to shake the titles of much property to their foundations. † It seems to insinuate what I have heard asserted, that the Catholics have not lost sight of their supposed claims, to be reinstated in the possessions, of which their ancestors were deprived. At all events, if there be any affinity between true eloquence and sound logick, this topick is not of a persuasive kind; nor conducive to the end, which he who uses it professes to have in view.

Here is the argument. “ My Catholick brethren, shed your blood to keep the present holders in possession of their lands. They are the heretical descendants of those *tinkers, smiths, and cobblers,*” ‡ (I do not find *butchers*, enumerated in the list,) who followed the fortunes of that usurping robber, Cromwell. Die, rather than permit them to be deprived of these estates, of which your ancestors were plundered by their *rude forefathers*; and which, if these low fellows lost them, might return to the right owners, *viz.* to yourselves.” Animated

* Page 9.

† As is observed in the pamphlet last cited.

‡ Page 44.

mated as this exhortation is, I can conceive its failing to produce the desired effect. But the parallel, besides being injudicious, is unjust. Of the acres distributed by the Protector amongst his followers, a considerable portion had been forfeited by Popish rebels, in the reign of Charles.* In depriving traitors of a property confiscated by their crimes, he did not act injuriously towards them; though in disposing of it, he usurped upon his Sovereign, to whom it had escheated, and of right belonged. Neither does the historian whom I have cited, although no friend to Cromwell, think his memory so infamous, as Mr. Scully represents it; † or that he should “load this with such reproaches, as his enemies throw upon it. ‡ Besides, what was the situation of Ireland, which was the scene of his most severe, and violent administration? The rebellion had broken out but a very few years before; and by that slaughter of which the Catholic Adviser complains, § he pretended to retaliate *the cruelty of the Irish massacre*; || which thus afforded a pretext, for what it could neither justify, nor excuse. Again, when the English settlers had declared for the Protector, ¶ did the Irish continue faithful to the Royal cause, and thus deserve to be defended from the mechanic swarms, whose inroads are mentioned by Mr. Scully with such disgust?

* Hume's England. † Page 43. ‡ Hume's England. Page 44. || Hume's England. ¶ Ibid.

disgust? No such thing. “ This desertion of the
 “ English put an end to Ormonde’s authority.
 “ Actuated by national and religious prejudices,
 “ the Irish could no longer be kept in obedi-
 “ ence by a Protestant governor. The clergy
 “ renewed their excommunications against
 “ him and his adherents;” and “ Ormonde
 “ soon after left the island; delegating his
 “ authority to Clanricarde, who found affairs
 “ too desperate to admit of remedy. The Irish
 “ were glad to embrace banishment. Above
 “ forty thousand passed into foreign service;
 “ and Cromwell, pleased to free the island
 “ from enemies, who never could be cordially
 “ reconciled” (not to republicanisin, or him,
 “ but) to the English” (connexion,) “ gave
 “ them liberty and leisure for their embarka-
 “ tion.”* Such is a summary of the proceed-
 ings of those days: which were not originally
 relevant to the present question; but of which
 Mr. Scully has compelled me to take a view.

I hope the topick of a consular partition of
 our lands, was not introduced as (what the
 law styles *inducement*;) to a comparison of
 this, with the Cromwellian distribution. But
 I fear, that for the praise lavished on the
 English Regulars and Militia,† no better mo-
 tive can be assigned,‡ than a wish to insinuate
 reprehension

* Hume’s England. † Page 47.

‡ Once for all, I extract no imputation, of motive, or
 meaning, from Mr. Scully’s general character. I am a mere
 commentator on the paragraphs of his work; and collect his
opinions

reprehension of our Protestant countrymen. The ostensible comparison is of the former to the French: but the really intended parallel seems to be that which I have suggested. Such commendations are bestowed on a principle resembling that, which urges some wives to entertain a second husband with the praises of the first.

I now attend Mr. Scully in his clinical lecture on the “sore and diseased state,” of the Catholic body: “those bleeding wounds, and gashes, to which salves and plaisters ought to be applied;” and all the evils of their “present political degradation.”* I protest this malady is of a most anomalous kind; where wounds, depressions, sores, and bruises, with enviable prosperity, † and brilliant rank, form altogether an heterogenous mixture, of most contradictory symptoms and indications: distracting the (not patient but) *impatient* subject; and calculated to bewilder one of those state physicians, who, undertaking to prescribe for *empires*, may be therefore styled empiricks; and of whose topical applications, the best that can be said is what we find asserted in this

D prelection,

opinions or *intentions* from no other source. Whenever I happen to misconstrue those paragraphs to his disadvantage, any charge founded on such misinterpretation will fall to the ground. The misconstruction will have been inadvertent, and my mistake may be corrected by the sagacity of his other readers.

* Page 49.

† Pages 6 & 7.

prelection ; that they are less mischievous than those of “ a foreign Charlatan.”

This calenture, (attended with the usual symptom, of a love for what is green,) this “ *frenzy*,” † (which we are called on to conciliate, not coerce,) this “ *fever*,” ‡ (which it is proposed to cure, by our losing blood to the patient,) Doctor Scully derives from those prosperous privations, with which a part of the Catholic body is afflicted. How kind, and sympathizing of that enlightened Mass, composed of the Catholic forty shilling freeholders of Ireland, to go distracted on account of a degradation, from which they have been long since relieved, and which “ presses now, not directly upon them ; but “ on the middling, and higher classes of their “ persuasion !” || It is the confidante going mad in stuff, to accompany the delirium of her noble friend in fatin. But

“ Who shall decide.—when *Doctors* disagree ?”

Now Doctor M^cNevin, if I mistake not, told the secret committee, that as for Catholic Emancipation, or Parliamentary Reform, patriotick and sonorous as the words might be, the things were what the people neither cared for, nor understood. Who, Mr. Scully, shall reconcile this dissension.

“ Betwixt two Casuists found, as *him*, and *thee* ?”

His authority, you will not dispute ; both because he is one of those men of integrity and talent,

* Page 50.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

|| Ibid.

talent, of whose intellect and morals you will not speak but with respect;* and because you have yourself resorted to the authority of Mr. Emmett, in his answer to the questions proposed to him by Lord Dillon. †

I ask pardon of Mr. Wickham, for this digressive apostrophe to my author; and returning, would observe that I cannot see how a censure of the bigotry of Protestants, ‡ or indignant remonstrance against Catholic subordination, tends to produce harmony between the two religions, or to promote a zealous cooperation to repel the common foe.

But the disappointments of 1795 were forgotten, when Hoche's force appeared; and all parties joined cordially to defend our violated coasts. This is interesting, and true. The peasants did act the meritorious part which is here || ascribed to them; and heavily responsible to their country, are those disturbers, who within the narrow period of eighteen months, perverting those loyal dispositions of our people, ripened treason to the maturity which it attained in 1798!

It is also true that the abolition of Catholic restraint, (if, under any circumstances an expedient measure,) would at such a moment of loyalty, have been well-timed. § But if oblivion of disappointment, and genuine allegiance gave the Catholics a claim to favour in 1796, let them strengthen these pretensions

D 2

by

* Page 25. † Page 33. ‡ Page 47. || Page 57.
§ Page 59.

by the like conduct now. Let not their advocates, in the more urgent crisis of the present day, found their claims in exaggerated views of their own depression, and slanders on that religion, to whose tolerance they apply. Let them not discard all gratitude for what they have obtained,—to make room for resentment that any thing is withheld. Let them not superciliously attribute to their own “wisdom, and unbroken energies,”* those acquisitions which they owe to the generous policy of their Protestant fellow subjects. Let them desist from insult, boasts of numbers, restless murmurs, and disaffection, and they will bring the case of their clients before Parliament, with a better grace, and fairer prospects of success.

Instead of this, Mr. Scully indulgently frames excuses for his flock. “You will say that a certain faction, a handful of bustling bigots, cannot longer be endured, and force you by their insults and outrages, to favour those foreigners.” †—You have, no doubt, abundant provocation, my countrymen, for treason: nevertheless, on the whole of the case, I think it expedient to refrain from French alliance; and I advise you to remain in the frying pan, where you are. Truly animating counsel! Bad as it is, Mr. Scully pronounces “this disloyal faction” to be “angels of mercy, in comparison with the French,” ‡ Indeed

* If these expressions have any meaning: page 6.

† Page 51.

‡ Page 52.

deed he is not singular in this abhorrence ; as may appear by the following extracts from *the Dublin Journal* of this day ; * a paper, with which you Sir, can be little acquainted ; but which I know to have been long a respectable and calumniated reservoir of loyalty in this country ; and from whose columns, (unobjectionable as they still remain) I have latterly missed with pain, *some* of the bold and decisive spirit, by which they were formerly distinguished.

“ On Tuesday last, *Robert Emmett* rendered up his life, in atonement for offences committed against his country. On the morning of that day, he talked to some of his particular friends, of his attachment to the principles of separation from England ; and *his abhorrence of French aid, and French conduct.* † Some allusion being made to French principles, and French government, he expressed *his abhorrence of both* ; lamenting the unhappy situation of the countries which had been *seduced by their influence, and now groaned under their despotism* ; and declaring his opinion, that the object of France, in invading this country, would be *plunder and desolation* ; and not *the welfare or happiness of the people* ” ‡

Here we find him coinciding in all the anti-gallicism of the Catholic adviser ; yet he “ acknowledged the facts, of which he had been
“ found

* Sept. 22.

† Ergo, Antigallicism, and Antianglicism are consistent :
Q. E. D.

‡ Dublin Journal.

“found guilty;”* and for which he deservedly suffered death upon a scaffold.

But Mr. Scully's *dissuasive* apology for disaffection is not closed. He again (to inspire cordiality) recalls the memory of those summary, and perhaps severe punishments of conspirators, to which he applies the name of massacre; † and (with a keen feeling and sympathy with those sufferings, ‡) admits that some years ago the Catholics “suffered much
“injustice, indignities, and calumny, from
“men of short lived power. There is no
“use, he thinks, in glossing over the situa-
“tion § of those whom he addresses.” It may reasonably be doubted, whether an angry enumeration of the indignities, which one class of subjects is supposed to have suffered from another, be calculated to promote, in a moment of common danger, the unanimity of both. But waving this objection, I beg to observe that the guilt of the prosecuted is not proved, by the bare admission of their prosecutor, that they are guilty. Therefore what Mr. Scully has so candidly confessed, I take leave as unequivocally to deny. *Dolus versatur generalibus*; and here there are no charges specifically detailed.

To proceed, I agree as to the expediency of
“making known to his Majesty's ministers,
“and defining to our Legislators, what are the
“wants and feelings of a great portion of the
“King's

* Ibid.

† Page 51.

‡ Page 52.

§ Ibid.

“ King’s subjects;”* but if it appears from those communications, that their *feelings* are disaffection, and their *wants* to put down the established religion of the country, it will be the duty of that Legislature, and Administration, rather to counteract the mischievous tendency of their sentiments, than to relieve their alleged necessities, by a sacriligious surrender of the church. Parliament, including no members of the Catholick persuasion, is according to Mr. Scully,† no authentic organ for uttering the sentiments of that body. If the pages which I am reviewing, contain a true statement of those sentiments, it may be well for that religion, that they have been hitherto unknown. To the ignorance of our Legislators, may in that case be attributed the abolition of the penal code. This disqualification of Parliament was acted on, by many Catholic disturbers in 1792, who elected, under the title of delegates, a sort of parliament of their own. But the vigour of the late Lord Clare interposed the convention bill between them and their designs; and many of those reformers have since developed their true intentions, and have accordingly suffered banishment, imprisonment, and death.—On this part of the subject I shall only observe, that to disclaim all privity and connexion with a Parliament, which Catholic votes contribute largely to return, and which before they did so, conferred on that religion elective franchise, with the
many

* Page 53.

† Ibid.

many other valuable and important privileges which they now enjoy, (including the superb foundation of Maynooth,) is neither gracious, just, nor grateful; nor while they have claims upon the tapis, is this disclaimer very prudent. As to the channel of communication between Catholics and their rulers. which their adviser recommends, * Government may not perhaps consider pamphlets, such as his, to be state papers of such high authority, as he would represent them. Nay some of them may rather excite a sentiment expressed by Mr. Burke, that there are writers, who instead of being answered by the speculatist, should be silenced by the Magistrate; and whom it is more easy, as well as necessary, to coerce, than to convince.

The merits of Lord Camden, or his amiable and worthy Secretary, do not stand in need of any testimony from me, My high opinion of the latter, however merited, may be tinged with some partiality, the result of gratitude for private kindness. But with the former I was unacquainted; and certainly did not owe him the slightest obligation. But the character of both is to be collected from the history of the times; and is above the censure of the Catholic Adviser, and my praise. I, therefore, shall not defend Lord Camden against scurrilous invective. One of the acts of his administration † was the institution of our gallant

* Viz. "occasional publications," p. 54.

† Of which (government) a considerable part of the praise must *at least* be extended to his Chief Secretary, Lord Pelham

gallant Yeomanry* : another, and I am persuaded a *consequential* event, was the suppression of a formidable rebellion ; for suppressed it was, before his successor arrived. Surely neither of these events can have been what exposed him to the displeasure of Mr. Scully !

But the Ringleader of those “ intemperate persons to whom the country was delivered over has been arrested by the Hand of Providence, in his career. † ” — False, ungenerous position ! O, Sir, would it be possible for even *the Poet’s eye*, to traverse that immeasurable distance, which separates Lord Clare from his Detractor !

I knew Lord Clare : and can never speak of *his* qualities but with respect ; ‡ nor ever recollect him, but with sentiments of warm and affectionate veneration. Who is faultless ? He was not : but most of his failings were the rank growth of a generously luxuriant soil. In our imperfect nature, every virtue has its kindred and contiguous vice. In eradicating these, we must be wary ; or we may pull up the good which is entangled with them : and where they yet remain, though we may desire their removal, we should candidly recognize the richness which produced them. Lord Clare was proud : but his pride was the excrescence of a genuine
E
dignity

* As is remarked by the Irish Loyalist.

† Page 55. Quere were lord Pelham, or lord Kilwarden of this *intemperate* faction ?

‡ Page 25.

dignity of soul. His prompt energies *may* have sometimes degenerated into precipitation; yet rather (I think) in manner, than in fact. A warmth of temper which he did not sufficiently controul, influenced his behaviour, though it could not blind his intellect, or warp his justice; and gave an air of heat and rashness to conduct, which in substance, if examined, would be found right. Add, that to vulgar and to sluggish minds, the ardour which they do not feel, assumes the appearance of irritation;—and the conclusion which their tardiness has not attained, will seem precipitate. Neither let it be forgotten, that a quick and ardent mind may yet be prudent: and with all its grave and deliberate airs, a cold and creeping understanding may lead to error, and indiscretion. Lord Clare's principles were unbending; but his sensibilities were great. He was the liberal protector of a prosperous tenantry, the kind patron of *the fatherless and widows*; and had a heart that could bleed for *the desolate, and oppressed*. (I borrow the language of a liturgy, which Mr. Scully's friends reject.) He was a vigorous enemy to the licentiousness of our people; because he was a staunch friend to the liberties of Ireland. He wished the subject to possess as great a share of freedom, as is compatible with the principles and safety of the freest constitution upon earth: and if at one period he countenanced a system of restriction, it was to obviate those dangers

dangers, which his large views discerned, and his prompt character at once resisted. He approved of a temporary abridgement of our liberties, for the purpose of preserving that threatened constitution, on whose safety our permanent freedom must depend. Poor fellow! though when alive he did not know the extent of my esteem, I do not the less heartily lament his loss; and with honest tears pronounce this feeble panegyrick,—wrung from me by an unjust and posthumous invective. Nor though I *in my conscience* believe (and every day encreases and tortifies the conviction,) that the appointment of his successor has been a national benefit, of singular and permanent importance,—will I therefore withhold my disinterested tribute from the silent dead; or dissemble my regret, that at a moment when active loyalty, integrity, and vigorous talent, are of a value so inestimable as to exceed all calculation, the menaced Empire has lost a great man, who possessed them. He is a cold-hearted and abject calculator, who silences all regret for the virtue and ability that are extinguished, by recollecting that living qualities of equal eminence supply their place. Lord Redefdale *is* a great man; and will from my respect for the memory of his predecessor, collect my susceptibility of admiration for himself. The good Lord Clare is alas “departed;”* but not “fallen:”† on

E 2

the

* Page 55.

† Page 61.

the contrary, his reputation will every hour encrease; and at length will give posterity a just picture of his merits.

Mr. Scully does not wish to be the annalist of the last Rebellion*. In truth he does not seem well qualified for such a task. Impartiality is essentially requisite to constitute a good historian; and I will leave it to my reader to decide, whether the *degree* of loyalty which is manifested by the Catholic Adviser, would permit him to be indifferent. “ Fifty thousand persons of all parties,” (i. e., loyalist and traitor) “ perished;” and seem from his account, to be *equally* lamented by Mr. Scully. I say seem; because I would not intimate that he in fact made no distinction. “ Sanguinary and unreflecting men, both the Loyal and the Rebel, indiscriminately outraged the innocent and guilty.†”

“ See Brother, how we apples swim !!”

In the Catholic Adviser’s “ rapid passage over these horrid scenes,” ‡ he makes no distinction between treason and allegiance; and forgets that the Law would make this difference between them, that the unreflecting rebel who survived the field, ran no small risk of encountering the scaffold. Indeed his picture of a thoughtless “ Rebel, outraging the person or property of a *guilty* loyalist,” § is rather obscure; unless the crime of this latter

aced
those

* Page 61.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

§ *Langens*

were his allegiance. But another part of this hasty sketch we can understand: his contrast between the situations of the innocent, and the guilty. “The latter, when they suffered, retaliated,” as he says: * “the former, applying vainly to the laws for redress, found the doors of justice closed by bills of indemnity, against them.” †——Who that read this short description, would be innocent,—unless he considered virtue as its own, and adequate reward? Mr. Scully prescribes guilt, as the means of retribution.

But “others obtained compensation, from the same Legislature that enacted those bills.” ‡ This sentence is plainly introduced, for the purpose of implying a charge of inconsistency on the government;—doubtless with a view to excite the fidelity of the people.) But to me the whole measure wears a different aspect; and reflects credit, in all its parts on the Legislature; who while, by a bill of indemnity, they protected the sanguine loyalist from the effects of excessive zeal, in a moment calculated to excite it,—at the same time passed an act of compensation, to obviate the injurious consequences of this zeal, to the innocent sufferer. But my adversary views this matter under an opposite light; and utterly condemning their erroneous conduct, declines vindicating the Rulers of that day. §

is. The vindication of his Majesty is so indecisive and disrespectful, that I really scruple

to

* 61.

† Ibid.

‡ Page 62. § Ibid.

to transcribe it, though for the purpose of animadversion. It is clear that Mr. Scully in page 63, does not waste his paper with the statement of irrelevant possibilities; (to which, as has often been remarked, there is no end,) but means, more pertinently and irreverently, to insinuate that what *may be*,—*is*.—Thus ‘pardon me for the quotation,) instead of a monarch who can do no wrong, we have a *king of shreds and patches*, (sewn together by the Adviser) who is not only “liable to mistakes” and abuses in the management of affairs, “and subject to fits of anger, prejudice, and caprice; but whose *nature* is to be at times obstinate, improvident, and ill-humoured; and even infatuated on particular subjects:” * whose state being extensive, his information is inaccurate, and his views are indistinct:” † one who by a quibbling crotchet “in an oath, ‡ circumscribes, for the present, the justice” which he is bound to render to his people.

This is no true portrait of the prince whom I obey; and seems rather to have been sat for by James the second, § than George the third. The gross misconduct of such a monarch must terminate in abdication.

But though by “the barkings of a Duigenan, and the fables of a Muirgrave,” || abetted by
an

* Page 63.

† Ibid.

‡ Page 65.

§ See the histories of his reign. I am far, however, from insinuating that Mr. Scully intended this picture for *him*.

|| Page 65.

an “ indigestible scruple of conscience,”* (produced by “ a quibbling crotchet, on an infatuated mind,”) “ the relief” of the Catholicks “ should for a *moment*, be obstructed,—yet their suspense will not be measured by eternity.” They “ see an enlightened Prince, beckoning them to the banner of *genuine* loyalty, and drawing lessons of future policy, from “ the patriotic Moira.”†

If an epitome of the above sentiments were rendered into French, it must be confessed that *Vive le Roi!* would not be the translation. *Genuine* loyalty the author sees only in embryo, and perspective; though he constitutionally wishes for its speedy birth: mean time, content with *imagining*,‡ he does not proceed to compass the death of the reigning King. But if the digestive powers of the Heir apparent’s conscience should prove feeble,—he is apprised how fervent will be the prayers of Mr. Scully for his royal life.

On the propriety of acceding to the Catholic wishes, I would not be understood as offering an opinion. But when I hear of the *fables* of a Musgrave, their adviser will pardon me, if I smile at the injudicious application of such an epithet to works, which, I fear, have nothing of the *fabulous* in their nature: and as to the barkings of a Duigenan, (as the head of our Ecclesiastical Law is *respectfully* called.)

I will

* Page 99. † Ibid.

‡ I advert to the language which Mr. Scully has unintentionally used, not to the sentiments which he entertains. In short, I speak of his pamphlet, and not of himself.

I will not degrade that learned and upright man, by vindicating his name against a pert invective. His inflexible integrity, his bold and manly understanding, (not the less interesting, for the strong lines which mark it,) the frank and generous, (perhaps over-)warmth of his disposition, his great information, and unshaken loyalty, compose a shield, which is sufficient to repel far more formidable weapons, than the pen of Mr. Scully,

But “the faction of ascendancy”* is become discontented, and clamorous against “British connexion.” Let me fairly expose my competence to discussion, by confessing that to this *faction* I belong. The ascendant of the established church will, I trust, ever be preserved; and if Catholics permit, I think, will never be abused. Having premised thus much, I would add that Protestants may indeed be dissatisfied, and with reason, at the conduct of some of Mr. Scully’s flock: nor is his pamphlet adapted to assuaging their discontents. But when he represents them as enemies to that British connexion, on which they must feel their very existence to depend, when he talks of a clamour which none but himself have heard, he gets beyond the marvellous, and expatiates in the empty regions of incredibility,

But they are incensed at “the demolition of their club-house.† This description of a great imperial measure, (I am not here investigating

* Page 65.

† Page 66.

‡ Ibid.

tigating its merits,) which, instead of demolishing, incorporated our Parliament with the British, is altogether as true as it is decent; and the utter abjuration and derision of a body, in whose return the Catholics conspired,—of whose liberality their privilege is the creature,—and to whom Mr. Scully owes his legal title, is equally merited, grateful, and becoming.

Pursuing my author in his train of topicks, aiming at no stricter method, than to make the series of my reply correspond with that of his arrangement, I now arrive at his encomiums on the men in power; and in his praise of the Lord Lieutenant I cordially agree.* Indeed I have never heard his merits disputed, or even doubted; and my respect for him has gradually mellowed to a sentiment, which unless the Roman poet be mistaken, I should repress: for,

“ Non bene conveniunt, nec in unâ sede morantur,
“ Majestas, et Amor.”——

But this very sentiment assures me, that his Excellency will spurn the praise, which is merely used as a vehicle for detraction; and whose author, converting its object to a stalking horse, insidiously endeavours to elude observation, while he asperges the characters of former Viceroy's, and eminent men in the state. With very amiable manners, and,

F

I am

* Pages 68. 69. 70. 71. 12.

I am persuaded, much purity of heart, I also take Lord Hardwicke to be a man of a penetrating, correct, and polished taste. He consequently must be one who,

———“*Malè si palpere, recalciaret, undique tutus.*”

Now, as this is an operation, to which I should be sorry to see a gentleman even figuratively exposed, I earnestly recommend to Mr. Scully to change henceforward, the mode of his approaches. I do believe the Lord Lieutenant to be “*firm* :” so much so, that the attachment of the loyal to his government, strong as it is at present, will be every day increasing; while the disaffected, finding their error, will give over their adulation. I cannot say what may be the extent of his Excellency’s “*legal information* :” but I am sure his constitutional knowledge is sufficient, to make him dissent, with more than ordinary disapprobation, from Mr. Scully’s view of the memory of King William, and his opinion of the events which attended the Revolution.

The refusal “to consign the county” I presume) of Limerick, “to the rigours of martial law,” is undoubtedly to be ascribed to the laudable cause which Mr. Scully has assigned: *viz.* the equally mild, as steady spirit of the present Administration. But there is no ground for attributing the applications which were thus resisted, to the alarms of timid men;* or for asserting that any of our
Nobility

Nobility need blush for what they did.* That county was much and seriously disturbed: Government had too good information not to know that it was so; and too much wisdom not to square their conduct to the occasion. Accordingly during the assizes, which including an adjournment of them, occupied ten days,—and at a special commission which followed after, Baron Smith, and Judge Osborne delivered the gaol completely; and made many severe, but salutary examples. In the course of those trials it appeared in evidence that there was a certain degree of organization in that quarter: that nightly meetings were held, and numerously attended; and houses plundered of their arms; and that on one night a small and ill appointed body (consisting of about a hundred and fifty men,) professed, and seemed to entertain, an extravagant intention, which however they afterwards abandoned. of making a sudden attack upon the town. These occurrences manifested a sufficiently insurgent spirit; and the events of the 23d of July, and present state of things, tend to shew that the alarm which they excited, was not a vain one.

But Mr. Scully thinks (for he is a gentleman, and he asserts it) that “the recent outrages in our metropolis were not formidable in their contrivance, or extent. The number of the intoxicated persons, who raised their arms against the government, did not

F 2

“ exceed

“ceed that of the Rioters at a country fair ;
 “and Lord Hardwicke’s discernment taught
 “him to distinguish between the desperation
 “of three or four hundred ruffians, and the
 “motions of a whole people.”* In this opi-
 nion of the Catholick Adviser I have heard it
 rumoured, (but do not believe) that he is join-
 ed by our late Commander of the forces. Nay,
 certain printed (but probably inaccurate) Re-
 ports ascribe the same encouraging language
 to persons high in situation. I, at all events,
 must avow a different opinion, I, who think
 that by closing our eyes, we do not diminish
 an approaching danger ; but merely weaken
 our means of resistance, or escape.

Lord Hardwicke saw this to be the mere
 desperation of a few ruffians ! whence then
 those strong and necessary proclamations, to
 which his Excellency’s signature is prefixed,
 and to which the names of so many Privy
 Counsellors are subscribed ? Whence the prompt
 and vigorous and extraordinary acts, which
 the Legislature hastened to ground on those
 proclamations ?—whence the numerous arrests
 —the excutions for high treason—the con-
 struction of barriers—the posting of guards—
 the escorts of Judges—the augmentation, the
 array, the vigilance, and alertness of all de-
 scriptions of military, which we have wit-
 nessed since ?

It is true that there is a degree of mysteri-
 ous obscurity, surrounding this abortive and
 extraordinary

* See note A at end of Letter.

extraordinary attempt. But is the peril less, because such clouds and darkness rest upon it?

Did the march of three hundred men from Naas to this city, or the assembling of one thousand, on the Commons of Rathcoole,* smack at all of a riot at a country fair? Were any informations, (what is become of them I cannot say,) respecting strange and important occurrences in a neighbouring county, given before a respectable magistrate of this City and Corporation? Did the number or the style of the Rebel Manifestoes prove this burst to arise merely from the desperation of a band of ruffians? Did the *cotemporary* proclamation issued by Russel in the North, demonstrate that the spirit had attained no height, and was but inconsiderably diffused? Did a Depot of fourteen thousand pikes, thirty thousand rounds of cartridge, a number of hand grenades, a quantity of bread, fuses for cannon, chains for stretching across the streets, †

evince

* Within seven miles of Dublin. Here were men, as well as arms. But as in other places we are informed that there were Captains without Companies, here there were Companies without Captains. This regiment had been appointed to rendezvous on those commons; and promised that it would there be met by leaders. None such appearing, the assembly dispersed. Of the *three or four hundred ruffians* who made the riot in our streets, about twelve hundred are thought to have concealed themselves after it was over, in the flat grounds which border the Liffey, between Dublin and Sarah's-Bridge.

† I do not undertake to enumerate all, or the greater part
of

evince this to be a plot, contemptible, in either "its contrivance or extent?" By which of those drunken rioters was the Minister accredited, who is at this moment in Paris, negotiating for French aid?* Disregarding the Declaration of Robert Emmett, (whose enthusiasm forbade his stating a gross and studied falsehood.) that he did not create, but found and joined, a Plot already formed, —and which would, without him, have gone on.†—shall we mistake him for the life-blood and the soul of treason? Can we be so weak as to confound the comparative insignificance of those commotions, which alarmed our metropolis on the 23d of July, with the dark extent of that conspiracy, from which they seem to have but boiled over? Or shall we on account of its minuteness, despise the petichial spot, which may denote a corruption of the general mass? In short can any man in his reason, addressing others, who possess theirs, compare this transaction to a riot at a fair,——thus insulting the Legislature, that could encounter such a pigmy outrage, with those vigorous and gigantic measures, which we have seen adopted?

Mr.

of what was found in this depot; nor wish to detain the reader by the suggestion of other matters, such as the explosion which betrayed the concealment of gunpowder; the detection of R. Emmett; the apprehension of Ruffel in Dublin; the circumstance of many persons being missed in the county of Wexford from their homes, &c. &c. &c.

* Mr. Emmett's Trial, page 96. † Ibid. page 103.

Mr. Scully having paid a transient compliment to the amiable qualities of Lord Cornwallis, (whose sanction of the “massacre” at Ballinamuck, he appears on this occasion to have forgotten,) the Lord Chancellor becomes next the object of his commendation.

Having already delivered my opinion that the appointment of such a man to the great seal of Ireland, is a reasonable subject of national satisfaction, it is superfluous to declare that I entirely concur in the praise which is here bestowed. Neither are the grounds laid for this eulogium either objectionable, or untrue: so that instead of controverting, I have only to add to what has been said.

Lord Redefdale is, in this paragraph, considered principally as a Judge; and I believe him to be as unobjectionable a one, as good temper, polished manners, integrity, and experience, with a sound, enlarged, and well cultivated understanding can compose. But it is rather to his character as a statesman that we should look, when we are considering how public measures will be affected by his opinions. Into the Cabinet his Lordship will carry the qualities which I have mentioned, and which are as requisite for the Council as for the Bench. He will also take with him that “sagacity,” which is justly ascribed to him by this passage, and that firmness, which it has omitted to enumerate amongst his dispositions; and which prevents his being such a contrast to his predecessor, Lord Clare, as the writer
(with

(with what object he best knows) would represent. This sagacity would lead him to distinguish the sentiments and situation of an English from those of an Irish Catholic; in order to determine, not whether he should be “the patron and benefactor”* of these latter; (for so large a portion of the King’s subjects is entitled to his protection;) but how far this patronage could be extended, without danger to our British connexion, or our established church. If the only grievance and depression under which Irish Catholics were found to labour, should be the superiority of our establishment, or existence of a system, judged necessary to maintain it,—not all the address or eloquence of Mr. Scully would prevail with his Lordship to assist in their removal. He would leave our oppressed and unpitied Catholics, (almost as much degraded as their brethren in Great Britain, confined to the unmolested enjoyment of property—and possession of civil liberty the most complete,—attended with no small share of political importance; and would turn an inexorable ear to their discontents, at being restrained from corroding the links which connect these islands, or razing the fair edifice of our reformed religion; † to erect their own in all its ancient splendour, on the site.

“Do we not see,” (asks Mr. Scully,) “at the head of our army, the brother of our
“ constant

* Page 72.

† Seemingly placed on the same footing with infidelity, by the last exhortation of Doctor Troy.

“ constant advocate, Charles Fox ?” *—To this I answer, *we do not*: nor though a Yeoman, and living in a time and place, which require military precaution, vigour and alertness, equal to any thing which on the twenty-third of July, our garrison displayed,—can I consistently with a due submission to the Royal pleasure, indulge a sentiment of regret at his removal †. With every respect for the *Commander of the Faithful*, ‡ (more indeed than I entertain for some of the Maidstone compurgators) I am bound to acquiesce in that exercise of the prerogative which has withdrawn him. But having been under arms on the night of our disturbance, and not unobservant of what has occurred

G

since,

* Page 72. See note B at end of Letter.

† Whether the Commander of the Forces should engross the whole, or obtain only a part, or finally be denied any portion of that praise, which is *somewhere* due, on account of the state of complete defence and preparation, in which the city was upon the night of the disturbance, is a question which I cannot answer; but which requires solution. Those to whom we are indebted should be known, in order to be rewarded as they deserve. Neither ought we to withhold our praise, merely because such previous information had been given, as was calculated to put those who received it, on their guard.

‡ Mr. Scully has, in page 73, conferred on this respectable officer, the title of Commander of the Catholics; which he will not deny to be synonymous with that of *Commander of the Faithful*. Indeed such a denial would contravene the pastoral address of Archbishop Dillon, and his suffragans; in which Roman Catholics are expressly designated under the title of *the Faithful*.—“ It is therefore our wish that
“ *the Faithful* be called on, at each *chapel*, by their respective Pastors, &c. &c. See Address.

since, I may without trenching on my reverence for Majesty, hope that he will be succeeded by as great energies as his own. Lamentable might our situation be, if our forces were placed under the dominion of a man, who instead of taking the armed loyalty of Ireland to his heart, should use his power to impede the exertions of this body ; or damp its ardour, by discouraging, and groundless insinuations ; and who, instead of reconnoitring the danger which he was to repel, should be deluded by that extenuating cant, and fulsome *patelinage*, with which Traitors would lull the Argus of government to repose, in order to seize the unwary moment for its destruction. With me, every mitigating sentence, which is uttered by such men, but serves to add a cubit to the stature of our danger.

Mr. Scully now proceeds to guard his Catholic Brethren “ against the dangers, which “ they have to dread from *domestic dissensions* ;” * and it must be confessed that the means which he has made choice of, are uncommon. They consist of a virulent attack on the Orange Associations ; and resentful catalogue of circumstances, the most likely to excite discord, and irritate those prejudiced and vulgar minds, which, from the style that he has selected, seem the objects of his address ; and to whose taste and understanding, his sentiments and language are, for the most part, alike and singularly

gularly well adapted. Having premised that he is not acquainted with a single member of the Orange Body,* and added, (more roundly than consistently,) that it is a society composed of knaves and fools, † he proceeds to prove (not the knavery or folly which he has imputed, but) the ignorance which he has admitted, by an account of their character and conduct, so destitute of foundation, that it reflects no credit on his truth; and so deficient in probability, that it does no honour to his invention. In short it is good for nothing, but to goad, or assuage the Catholic feelings; and which of these effects it is best calculated to produce, is for the reader to determine. I shall merely observe that I have not only read, but (as of course he wished me,) have *applied*, that part of his quotation ‡ from Mr. Burke, which adverts to “blowing up the blind rage of the populace;” and to certain “pestilential libels, which infect and poison the very air we breathe.”

He ascribes to the Orange-Men, the commotions in Armagh. These preceded the existence of that association; and arose between the *Peep of Day Boys*, and *Defenders*. The Orange Society (of which I am not, nor ever have been one, grew (as an antidote) out of that of the United Irishmen. The inadequacy of the laws, yet unfortified by those strenuous measures which were afterwards adopted, rendered

G 2

dered

* Page 76.

† Page 75.

‡ Page 79.

dered it necessary for loyal men to embody for their own protection; else, dispersed, they were miserably and one by one cut off. The perils of the country continuing, and so encreasing, as more than to keep pace with the strong provisions made against them, Administration *may have* indirectly countenanced* this loyal and coherent body. How the fact was, I do not know; but this I perceive clearly; that all which is urged against them (for the charges of assassination are untrue,) proves only, that in ordinary times such institutions may be objectionable. Hence it is *wisely* concluded that they are not adapted to a great emergency; and ought equally on such occasions to be discouraged and put down. But such an inference, sound logick will not justify; and political reason might lead to the opposite conclusion: else we must adopt the novel maxim, of *different case — like rule.* †

As to the “short-sighted terrors of the con-
“niving government,” ‡ the events which followed, refute this charge of timid and erroneous alarm. I advert to the transactions of the year 1798; which wore rather a serious aspect at Wexford and Scullabogue; and which we conceived to amount to a Rebellion: but this tract informs me they were merely *a civil war.* || Thus the Yeomen and the Trai-
tors

* Page 75.

† The legal maxim, on the contrary, is *like case, like rule.*

‡ Page 75.

|| Page 89, and passim.

tors stand *in pari delicto*: unless, goaded to resistance by the intemperance of their Rulers,* the latter may appear more excusable in Mr. Scully's eyes.

This gentleman is aware that his "countrymen are exposed to *great and trying temptations*; † and inasmuch as if they yield, "and swerve from their loyalty," ‡ their offence must be venial, in proportion to these inducements, I am surpris'd that he, whose object it was to excite allegiance, should suggest a consequence too obvious to have been overlooked. He feels that "they have much "to dread from their own rashness, credulity, and *resentments*:" § therefore, in order to allay, and counteract them, and cordially to attach his flock to their fellow subjects, and their government,—he adverts to tithes, under the appellation of "the exactions of "the Parson:" ¶ to "the burdensome land "tax," prostituted on "the repair of churches, "where not half a dozen of" those impious hereticks "attend:" ¶¶ to the disability of the "Catholicks to fill corporate offices; and "their exclusion (in a country, in which "their ancestors have flourished, in former "times, **) from professional honours, posts "of dignity, and all share in the Legisla-
"ture:"

* Page 95, and passim. † Page 89. ‡ Ibid.

§ Page 90. ¶ Page 96.

¶¶ Page 97. See the just observations of the Irish Loyalist on this subject; p. 35.

* Page 1.

“ ture:” to the “ damping of their spirit, the
 “ quenching of their ambition, and bereaving
 “ their honest industry of its fair reward.”*
 The object of such allusions may be truly
 said to be

“ Inscrutable, invifible,
 “ As a nofe on a man’s face, or a weathercock on a
 “ fteeple.” †

With the like commendable intention, he
 resorts to the following soothing topics of dis-
 cussion. “ He knows of many diftricts over-
 “ run by gangs of armed orange ruffians, who
 “ *prozel* (he uſes the preſent tenſe,) amongſt
 “ the Catholicks in the ſilence of night, to
 “ gratify the love of plunder, or the worſt of
 “ paſſions. Theſe invade their cottages, vio-
 “ late their females, and levy contributions,
 “ at the muzzle of a piſtol.” ‡—How judi-
 cious and harmonizing is the introduction of
 this picture! What a pity that it repreſents
 that which never had exiſtence,—and which
 the author has elſewhere denied to exiſt at
 preſent! “ You are not frightened from your
 “ houſes, by outrages upon your properties,
 “ or perſons.” ||

But waving the contradiction, let me con-
 clude, by the following extract, my notice of
 his laudable endeavours to aſſuage Catholick
 exaſperation. “ The ſorry faction here, theſe
 “ anarchical” Orange “ Affociators who may
 “ hereafter

* Page 98,
 || Page 68.

† SHAKESPEARE.

‡ Page 104.

“ hereafter act the tragedy of the Cromwel-
 “ lian Revolution, and bring their Monarch
 “ to the scaffold,—would rather see their
 “ Catholic countrymen rushing upon mutual
 “ slaughter, and becoming rebels to their
 “ King, exiles from their land, or slaves to an
 “ Invader, than that they should not bow be-
 “ neath their yoke.”* He then enjoins his
 Readers to fight on the side of these san-
 guinary oppressors; and embryo Regicides.
 The insertion of this vision would be into-
 lerably disgusting, but for the tranquillizing
 purposes, which it is to serve. As it is, I
 shall only say that the Dreamer resembles an
 Astronomer, of whom we read in a work as
 fabulous as his own; †, who mistook the mote
 which he had magnified, for a monster in
 the Sun. But the present author is entitled
 to indulgence. “ The members of this so-
 “ ciety are to him as so many ghosts;” ‡ and
 having raised such horrid phantoms, it would
 be surprizing, if he was not in a bewildered
 state of terror and consternation. Yet, for
 the credit of his intrepidity, it must be al-
 lowed that his alarm does not prevent him
 from being an impartial enemy to extremes.
 He therefore bestows upon the quiet and un-
 offending Methodists, (described under the
 periphrasis of pillaging, hypocritical, canting,
 swadling

* Page 80. and 81.

† Not the fables of Musgrave, but (I believe) Æsop.

‡ Page 85.

swadling knaves, *) whatever abuse he can spare from the contrastedly energetic Orange Body ; though indeed he is so liberal of coarse invective to these latter, that we may believe what is asserted in page 85, of his not being acquainted with any *gentleman*—of that society.

Apprehensive that all his well meant pains to calm the tumults and anxieties of the Catholic mind, (although an endearing threat of assassination is thrown in, †) may notwithstanding fail to produce the desired effect,—he terminates these statements, by requesting his congregation “to beware of permitting their passions to hurry them into greater excesses” than those (according to him sufficiently atrocious,) “of which they complain.”

I have heard an anecdote, of which I am reminded by this passage. Some College Lads (as we call them) being engaged in inflicting the Academic punishment of *pumping* on an offender, a student, who happened to pass by during the operation, cried, “Ah! Boys—“don't nail his ear to the pump!” these however, instead of attending to the recommendation, profited by the hint ; and the Adviser thus, by cautioning them “to beware,” occasioned that, which (we must suppose,) he intended to prevent.

As Mr. Scully's good intentions might be as cruelly defeated, I am on the whole disposed

posed to wish that he should never again resume his pen ; but abdicating the dictatorial authority which he has been exercising, should retire to that

“ *Cool, sequestered vale of life,*”

for which he avows so steady an attachment ; * and to which he appears to be as fitted by talent, as inclination. Let him freely indulge his propensities to a retirement, which those who think with me, will wish never to molest.

I indeed feel for the disappointments, to which he may otherwise be exposed. Deaf to his warning voice, and unappeased by his pathetic enumeration of their sufferings, his furious audience, (like those whom Mark Anthony once addressed,) might be stimulated to hostility against their Protestant fellow subjects ; and be even encouraged to this breach, by a circumstance, on which the Moderator of their passions dwells. I mean that “ paucity of Protestant numbers,” which he represents as so contemptible, that “ in many, (*not Northern*) “ districts, they are not even “ to be heard of : and in short, that Catholics are to them, in about the ratio of a “ regiment to its files and drums”. †

On the other hand, punctilious critics may tack many animadversions to those which I have made. They may enquire how far this contempt of the Protestant numbers accords

H

with

* Page 91.

† Page 57.

with the terrors, which in page 51 they are represented to excite. They may alledge that the computation, which states the Catholicks to constitute four-fifths of the people, is more remarkable for its tendency, than for its truth *. They may analyse, and endeavour to extract disloyalty from, that passage, in which the French are reproached with having been tardy to relieve their friends against the Orange Invader †. They may admit that the memory of such Catholicks as Mr. Scully, if of marble, ‡ preserves the record of fancied grievance, not of real favours. They may oppose the authority of Mr. Burke § to his admirer, Mr. Scully, when this latter states that, “ after” nothing more serious, than merely “ the slaughter or exile of two or “ three millions, the French having gained “ the opportunity of firmly fixing their liber- “ ties, and calmly choosing their own form “ of government, all their friends in other “ countries hoped that, pursuing a noble line “ of conduct, they would now produce some “ admirable masterpiece of a free constitu- “ tion. ||” They may proceed to compare, (not for the purpose of displaying *opposition*, but *agreement*,) this sublime indifference to the lives of millions, with the sentiment of a Jacobin, of the name of *Redbeard*, who was tried for sedition in 1794. The conduct of this man decided in *the affirmative*, the following

* Page 57. † Page 13. ‡ Page 95. § See Mr. Burke's Reflections. || Page 26.

ing question, which he had proposed, on paper. "Suppose," (he had written,) "a revolution should cost a hundred thousand lives: would the benefit be worth one hundred thousand lives? But a revolution may cost five hundred thousand: perhaps a million. Would the benefit be equal to that price?"

These snarling criticks might go on to comment on Mr. Scully's references to the authority of Thomas Emmett, by observing first, that if the whole of his evidence be believed, we should not hear tithes described as oppressive exactions of the Parson: secondly that when a state offender is making discoveries, to procure safety either for himself, or for his friends, (which *latter* I believe to have been the object of poor Emmett,) it is better to hear his statements of such facts, as if untrue, are liable to be refuted, than to admit the theories which may be suggested, or the declarations of opinions or principles which may be made, by a person so circumstanced, at the time of his examination.

Thus a disaffected man, who dreaded the consequences of Orange loyalty, might silyly represent the augmentation of that body, as tending to encrease the United Irish, and the friends of France.† Again, if he wished to delude Administration, into the adoption of a system, (miscalled conciliatory,)

H 2

which

* See note C, at end of letter.

† Page 83.

which, by giving influence and impunity, would promote the purposes of treason, he would declare the intention of the Rebel Directory to have been, to discard the French, “if Government adjusted its differences with the people.”*

Nay the malice of such commentators might not stop here. They might criticise that strange and monstrous structure, whose stature (Mr. Scully tells us) is to *reach the skies*, and its base engross the entire surface of our soil.† This edifice, cemented with the blood of millions, they might invidiously mistake for the Church of Rome; and imagine they discovered “*Horror plumed*” upon its summit. In a word, they might *sneeringly* assent to Mr. Scully’s position, that “every wicked junto “professes the most plausible purposes, in order to veil the most villainous designs;” ‡ and

* Page 61.—I am here giving Mr. Scully the advantage of a concession, which I can very well spare; but might refuse. It appears from one of the state papers of rebellion, (promulgated about the time of Lord Moira’s coming to this country,) to have been the order of the day, that no conciliations on the part of Government should be allowed to arrest the progress of disaffection.

† The plan, as given by this political Architect, is as follows: “Our patriotism will have raised a splendid monument, more durable than the marble pillar. Its head shall reach the summits of our lofty mountains; its extent shall be as spacious, as the superficies of Irish soil.” Page 114.

I know not what Mr. Burke would say of this *elevation*; but if the reader will not admit its *obscurity* to be *sublime*, he must surely, and at least, confess that its *sublimity* is *obscure*.

‡ Page 81.

and might enquire what enemy it was *really* intended that “from their bogs and their de-
“files,” our gallant pikemen “should an-
“noy.”*

These, my Dear Sir, are amongst my reasons, for *protesting* against the counsels of the Catholick Adviser. In a moment so critical and awful as the present, I choose rather to commit my country to the care of Lord Hardwicke

* Pages 111 and 111. We find our Pikemen, at an early period, fighting for “*la Croce*;” and from the Poet’s description of their “*shaggy forms*,” they seem to have resembled their modern portrait, as given by Humbert.

“Questi dall’ alte felve *irsuti* manda
“La divisa dal mondo, ultima *Irlanda*. (a)

In a still more distant age, we see them *abetting France*; under the command of the Earls of *Desmond*, and *Kildare*; who were both of the illustrious family of *Fitz-Gerald*; and appear to have borne very nearly their present arms. (b)

“Or guarda gl’ *Ibernesi*, apresso il piano:
“Sono due squadre; e il *Conte di Chiltera*
“*Mena la prima*: il *Conte di Desmond*
“Da fieri monti ha tratta la seconda.”

But waving an anachronism, which is not mine, but Ariosto’s, and which makes the great men of (at farthest) Henry the second’s day—cotemporary with Charlemagne, do I insinuate that the descendants of *Desmond* and *Kildare* (some of the very noblest blood, which our country has to boast of,) would follow the remote example which I have recorded? I do; and am glad to feel persuaded that they would. Their ancestors assisted a powerful, revered, and *Christian* Prince, to baffle the attacks of an *Infidel* invader. Surely these would do the same: for they would defend the Realms of George the Third, against the efforts of *Bona parte*.

(a) *Tasso*. (b) “*Nel bianco, una vermiglia banda.*”

wicke and yourself, assisted by the opinions of those eminent persons in the state, of whom I have had occasion to notice one of the most principal in this letter.

Indeed I cannot but be glad that our affairs are in your care; because I wish well both to Ireland, and to you. In a moment like the present, the reins of Government should be swayed by vigorous and skilful hands; and the conjuncture affords to an able man who holds them, a fair and honourable opportunity for stamping his reputation. Of this I wish an old and respected acquaintance to avail himself.

I consider our situation to be delicate, in more ways than one. Not merely because we are at war with a malignant enemy, and (I scorn to wink at danger, or deceive myself or others,) that our country is in a state of alarming disaffection. These considerations, perhaps, only prove the necessity for *quickly throwing in an ample, well provided, and well officer'd, military force.*

It is Sir, because the state of things has been lately changed, by a measure opposed by much of the sense and loyalty of Ireland. O! that I could transfuse into every mind, the unalterable convictions which press upon my own, of the necessity that exists, for justifying the adherents, and conciliating the *liege* opponents of an Union; *—by a cordial and *respectful* care of the interests of this country.

Let

* See note D at end of Letter.

Let not the former be driven to find excuses for their support, in alledging that if the interests of Ireland should be neglected, an event so *improbable* could never have been foreseen: nor the latter be compelled to seek for consolation, in the sagacity which predicted, and the patriotism which resisted those evils which they deplore. No—No—Great Britain will act the part, for which her Minister solemnly undertook, on the 24th of January 1799.*—Government will apply that purchase, *which they declared to be all that was required*, for raising the firm prosperity of our Church and State. They will feel that Union is a great imperial engine, which must be worse than uselefs, if left unemployed.

I have the honour to be,

With great respect, Dear Sir,

Your very faithful humble servant,

A YEOMAN.

Dublin, Sept. 23d. 1803.

P. S. This letter having been written à *baton rompu*, and completed, (without correction, except of proofs,) within four days, may, perhaps be, on this account, thought entitled to indulgence. It is proper to add, that Mr. Wickham has never seen or heard of it, previous to publication. The anonymous author has taken the liberty of writing

* See Mr. Pitt's Speech in the British House of Commons.

ing to him, as a public man, without having obtained his permission, for that purpose. He therefore is himself alone responsible for all that is contained in the foregoing pages; nor can he tell whether the sentiments will meet the approbation of the Right Honourable Gentleman to whom they are addressed.

It now *begins* to be asserted, (how truly I cannot determine,) that amongst his brethren, Mr. Scully's work is generally disapproved. That it is by many of them, I am persuaded. But of *some*, I should be tempted to enquire the grounds of their disapprobation. Whether do they object to those doctrines which they conceive him to entertain,—or to the indiscreet explicitude, and which he may appear to have avowed them? They *may* think him wrong, for having *let the cat out of the bag*.

In truth, Mr. Scully is not the only person, who may be accused of having *blabb'd*. I have already adverted to Doctor *Troy's* address; in which the Protestant Religion is openly put on the same footing with *Infidelity*;—by injunctions of obedience, which, if the French had gained an ascendant in this country, would equally apply to enforce submission to Bonaparte. I now advert to another, *titular* exhortation to allegiance,—addressed by the Connaught Dignitaries to their flock;—in which something *cloven*, (I do not mean a mitre,) may be traced; and which, conformably to the system that classed *our* heresy under

under the head of Paganism, confers on the Roman Catholics, the exclusive title of “*the Faithful.*” *

This too Scullyrian admonition is, however, intended for “*the lower orders;*” and any passages of equivocal import, which it may contain, will be weighed and construed, with the discernment, coolness, and discrimination, for which that class of our countrymen is distinguished. Add that it is to be occasionally explained in Irish; and by means of such a version, any inaccuracies which occur in the original, will be lost, in the purity and refinement of that tongue. If it were not for these advantages, I should fear that a flock, habituated to such instructions, might soon possess little of the sheep, except its cloathing; and that many a *lupinum caput* † would be found amongst them. As it is, they will make a right use of such topics as the poverty of their clergy, their scanty means for education, and want of other places for worship than *sub dio*; and will, by those suggestions, be confirmed in their allegiance. The like effect will be produced by that transient intimation of “*the sources, from whence*” viz. the scruples of our Sovereign, the illiberal parsimony of our legislature, and the fren-

I zied

* See an extract from this address in Note †, page 41, of this pamphlet.

† I cannot say what this is, *hibernicé*; but *anglicé*, it may be rendered *outlaw*.

zied bigotry of the Protestant body. This insinuation is succeeded by a pathetick glance at the woes of our Catholick countrymen, accompanied with a hint that they are denied even the consolation of bewailing these aloud, —and a conciliatory and discreet prediction, that “ Prosperity will never dawn upon this island, whilst every wicked pretext is employed to foment disunion amongst the King’s subjects, and the name of religion is prostituted for purposes of irritation:” *i. e.* (as is manifest from the context,) so long as the Government and the Protestants pursue their present line of conduct.—In the *Iberno-Celtic* version of this address, the above paragraphs will, as I presume, tally more exactly, than in the original they appear to do, with the Pastor’s wish that “ the name of party should not be heard; that murmurs, jealousies, and animosities should be sacrificed,” and forgotten; and that the exhorted “ should cling, with *Catholick loyalty*,” (Quere, what species of allegiance this may be?) “ around the throne.”

For this sacrifice they are in the opinion of their Exhorters, “ called upon by the voice, “ as well of *gratitude* as of duty; and it only remains for the *Translator* to explain how, by having left their clergy in a state of uneducated penury, and without parochial chapels for celebrating their religion,—how, by causing the calamities of our country, and refusing to our victims the feeble comfort of complaint,

plaint,—how by wicked pretexts, applied to foment difunion amongst the people,—by “the narrowest prejudices, and most acrimonious intolerance,” and by a prostitution of the name of religion to the purposes of unkindness,—we have entitled ourselves to the gratitude of our Catholick fellow subjects.

If this should not be explicable, by even the copiousness of our native tongue, yet still the address might prevail upon its hearers to “unite, for the preservation of *their holy religion* ;” and to pray that “our Sovereign’s” (yet misguided) “councils may be directed for the accomplishment of measures, which, dispelling the gloom of distrust, rejecting the wretched expedients of coercion,—and abandoning a policy founded on injustice,” may (at length) “promote the peace and happiness of his people.”

I have this day, * read another “Exhortation ;” which is to be pronounced “distinctly and impressively” for the benefit of “the lower orders” of the Roman Catholic “Communion ;” and as I do not conceive that it will require “a long ten years siege, to lay this Troy in ashes,” am instigated to the attempt, by a *sortie*, which, from one of the notes, is made upon myself.

I 2

As

* October 18th 1803. This exhortation, signed I. T. Troy, appeared in the Hibernian Journal of yesterday, October 17th.

As soon as the Congregation has yawn'd over those mouldy common places against Bonaparte, with which, in due forms of mawkish invective, this dissertation opens, they are recompens'd by a narrative, as busy and eventful, as formerly won the heart of Desdemona. Here, "with a greedy ear," they may "devour" Maximian, Julian, Chrysofom, Tertullian, Saints Augustin and Justin, Pagan Emperors, Christian Fathers, and the gallant Theban legion in array. The only danger to be apprehended, is—that this historical Rareeshow may puzzle the coarse assembly to which it is presented; and that they may not discern its force, as an argument for allegiance. When informed that the "virtuous champions," included in the above list, were "bound by the religion of Christ, to their idolatrous Master," they may not discriminate with so much precision, as—while identifying themselves with the Christian heroes there described, not to confound the Infidel Master, with our King. They may not perceive that, while one half of the parallel is affirmed, the other should be denied. To those however, for whom this Sermon is principally intended, *viz.* the vulgar, perhaps *the Notes* are to be impressively and distinctly read; and from these they will learn that this is an argument, which "Logicians call à *fortiori*:" a term, which may at the same time, be translated, and explained. But the grand difficulty will be, for Doctor Troy to reconcile

concile his assertion, that faith should be kept with Hereticks, and Protestant Princes be obeyed,—with certain proceedings of the Lateran Council, and that of Constance; and with his declared opinion as to the *implicit* adherence, to which the decrees of such infallible synods are entitled.”

I admit that, without resorting to the notes, we may collect the reasoning, from a subsequent passage in the text; † and if this paragraph stood alone, I might not advert, unless with praise, to the exhortation which contained it. I only lament that, by other parts of the same discourse, its tendency is not merely weakened, but destroyed. If Doctor Troy would learn how Roman Catholics ought, in a moment like the present, to express their loyalty, let him read the address, agreed to at a late Roscommon meeting; and
presented

* In pages 31 and 32 of his pastoral instruction of 1793, Dr. Troy declares that Roman Catholics “consider the “decisions of their general councils as *infallible authority* in “points of doctrine;” and again, (page 72) that “the “Church is infallible in her doctrinal decisions and canons, “on points of faith and morals; and therefore that Catholics “are obliged to adhere implicitly to such decrees and canons of the church, assembled in *general council*, and “confirmed by the Pope, as to rules of faith:” adding that “on these points, all Catholics are agreed, as on “immutable articles of their faith.”—In the notes, page 32, he refers to the authority of the fourth Lateran, held anno 1215, and the Council of Constance, which condemned the doctrines of Hus and Wicliffe in 1414, as *general councils*.

† Beginning thus: “If then, we are conscientiously obliged,” &c. &c.

presented to the Government by the Earl of Fingall: a composition, the general tenor of which I so much approve, that I will not object to certain clauses, which yet ought to be expunged.*

But “the seditious doctrines of” (the first Reformers,) “*Hufs* and *Wicliffe*, were condemned by the Council of Constance.” † Some of their opinions were certainly there reprobated by the Romish church; and one of these repudiated doctrines was, that *no heresy ought to be exterminated by power; but by disputation in the schools.* Agreeably to their condemnation of a maxim so insipid, they expressly appointed the punishment of *burning*, for all obstinate adherents to the heterodoxy of *Wicliffe*; ‡ and justified the treachery of *Sigismund* to *Hufs*, because no promise should be kept with hereticks, to the prejudice of the Catholic faith. § — Such are the decisions of this *general Council*; whose decrees are maintained to be *infallible*, by *Doctor Troy*; unless he has relinquished the opinions which he avowed

* This address appears in the Evening Post of this day, October 18th 1803.

† Doctor Troy’s Exhortation, dated 10th October, 1803.

‡ Vide Labbe. Concil. Constan. page 898; and page 11 of S. N’s candid and judicious “Inquiry into the Consistency of Doctor Troy’s Pastoral Instruction,” (dated 26th Feb. 1793.) “with the declaration agreed to by the Roman Catholic Committee, on the 15th of March, 1792.

§ Constan. Sess. 18. S. N. page 13.

avowed in 1793. But that this is not the case, I must presume, from his now citing the ordinances of this assembly, to demonstrate the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion.

But he resorts to their decrees, for the purpose of insinuating that the doctrine preached by the early Reformers, and which the Romish church condemned, was that of a right in subjects to depose their sovereign. Whether is this credible,—or *odiously* the reverse? Is it consistent with that decretal of Pope Gregory, (not dissented from, by any majority of bishops,*) which, notwithstanding compacts the most solemn, absolves from fidelity and obedience, to persons fallen into heresy?† Is it compatible with the haughty conduct of Paul to our Elizabeth,—or with the Bull of Pius

* In page 72 of his Pastoral Instruction of the year 1793, Doctor Troy pronounces that “Catholicks are obliged to submit to similar decisions and decrees, (*i. e.* which are doctrinal, on points of faith, and *morals*;) “of the “Pope, when expressly or tacitly assented to, or *not dissented from*, by the majority of Bishops, representing and governing the church dispersed.” He adds, that “on these points Catholicks are agreed, as on immutable articles of their faith.”—See also S. N. page 8. where it is pertinently observed, that “that Rights of Kings, and the duties of subjects,” form “a point of *morality*, of very great importance.”

† Decret. Gregor. IX. “*Absolutos se noverint a debito fidelitatis, hominii, et totius obsequii, quicumque lapsis manifeste in Heresim; aliquo pacto, quacunque firmitate vallato, tenebantur adstricti.*” See S. N. page 12.

Pius (affixed by a zealous Catholic to the bishop of London's gate,) which depriving that princess of all title to the crown, released her subjects from their oaths of allegiance? Or is it to be reconciled with the proceedings of the fourth Lateran (which was a general) Council,—and which not only promulgated, but exerted, the power of stripping heretical sovereigns of their dominions, and absolving subjects from their obligations to obedience?—On the contrary, the inconsistency is so obvious, and glaring, that, not having adopted Tertullian's rule of faith, (*viz, credo, quia impossibile est*;) I cannot believe that the deposing doctrine was that, which the Council of Constance intended to condemn.

We may indeed lament that there are obstacles so insuperable, to our acquiescence in the positions of the Catholic Arch Pastor: positions *equally* calculated to evince, and to excite, the sentiments of Christian charity towards the Protestants of this country; by representing the first Reformers as fomenters of sedition, and the Roman church as the secure asylum of allegiance. But, may not these calumnies of the reformed religion be considered as coming awkwardly from a body, who in the same breath complain, that their faith and principles are cruelly defamed? In a moralist, whose works I have already cited, I recollect, in my childish days, to have read of an interview between a wolf and lamb; in which the former, with great sensibility, remonstrated

monstrated against certain slanders, of which he had been the object. This complaint he terminated with becoming spirit; and proved that he was not blood-thirsty, by devouring his opponent.*

“ Heresies,” says Doctor Troy, † “ are classed by Saint Paul with wrath, envy, murders, drunkenness, and other works of the flesh: therefore it would follow from the *uncharitable*, and seditious principle, *imputed by some Protestant writers to Roman Catholics*, ‡ that a grievous sin of their Catholic Sovereign would free them from their allegiance to him. Such were indeed” (he admits candidly,) “ *the seditious doctrines of Hufs and Wycliffe*,” (whose opinions may be considered as the *incunabula* of Protestant faith; §) who produced “ insur-
K “ rection

* This is a fable; and does not record, although it may resemble, any thing which occurred at Scullabogue. It is found amongst the pastorals of an *Arch-fabulist* of the name of Æsop; though something like it may perhaps be traced, in the town-eclogues of Arch-bishop Troy: and if similar compositions continued to be read “ *impressively*,” to the lower orders, we might shortly find the *campos ubi Troja fuit*, filled with instances of ferocity, and footsteps of devastation. Milton also tells a story of *the grim wolf, with privy paw*, &c.

† In the Exhortation of 10th October 1803.

‡ See the fable last cited.

§ “ Upon the whole, it very plainly appears, from his” (Wickliff’s) “ writings, that the doctrines which he taught, “ were very nearly the same with those, which were propa-
“ gated

“ rection in England, and bloodshed in Bohe-
 “ mia. But such is not the doctrine of our
 “ holy religion, which” (on the contrary, and
 unlike that of Protestants,) “ condemns
 “ them.”*—Can you doubt my brethren, that
 the Catholic faith discourages sedition, and
 promotes

‘ gated by our more successful reformers, in the sixteenth
 ‘ century.’”

Henry’s History of Great Britain, b. iv. ch. 2. § 2.

“ The doctrines of Wickliffe were nearly the same with
 “ these, which were propagated by the reformers, in the
 “ sixteenth century: he only carried some of them farther
 “ than was done by the more sober part of these Reformers.
 “ He denied the doctrine of the real presence, the supre-
 “ macy of the church of Rome, the merit of monastic
 “ vows. He maintained that the scriptures were the sole
 “ rule of faith, that the church was dependant on the State,”
 &c. &c.

Hume’s Hist. of England:—Richard II.

With the clergy of his own day, Wickliffe appears
 (*notwithstanding* his denial of the supremacy of the Romish
 church,) to have been as little in favour, as he is with Doc-
 tor Troy. “ As the clergy had hated and persecuted him
 “ with great violence during his life, they exulted with in-
 “ decent joy, at his disease and death; ascribing them to
 “ the immediate vengeance of Heaven, for his heresy.
 “ *On the day of St. Thomas the martyr,*”* (says Walsingham)
 “ *that limb of the devil, enemy of the church, idol of heretics,*
 “ *sewer of hatred, author of schism, &c. John Wickliff,*
 “ *was, by the immediate judgment of God, suddenly struck with*
 “ *a palsy, &c. &c.* but these reproaches do honour to his
 “ memory;” &c. &c.

Henry, book iv. ch. 2. § 2.

* This English is not mine, but Doctor Troy’s; whom
 I am bound to quote with fidelity. I wish his inaccuracies
 and *faulſe conſtructions*—had been confined to ſtyle.

* *i. e.* Pecket; whose persecutions of Henry II. furnish a good commen-
 tary on Dr. Troy’s text, of Catholic obedience to crowned heads.

promotes loyalty to Protestant governors.—when you recollect that it prohibits keeping faith with Hereticks,*—and, for the extermination of infidelity, prefers faggots to syllogisms? † When you call to mind the decretal of Gregory, ‡ the bull which absolved the subjects of Elizabeth from their allegiance, the sanction of this proceeding by the Lateran Council, § or the deposition of the heretic Raymond, and grant of his dominions to Count Montfort? ||

Great an adept in logick as he claims to be, the learned Doctor has overlooked a plain objection to his argument; *viz.* that in referring to the classification of St. Paul, he merely proves a diversity, which I am ready to admit, between the doctrines of that Apostle, and those which are acknowledged by the church of Rome. If according to the Saint, a choleric or envious Monarch is as ill entitled, as a heretick, to obedience from his subjects,—the case is otherwise decided by the fourth Lateran, and Council of Constance. Thus, on the whole, the Doctor's reasoning *seems* feeble, casuistical, and shamefully evasive. If it be not so, let his sincerity be evinced, by a plain, unvarnished answer—to the following questions.

K 2

First,

* Council of Constance.

† Same Council.

‡ *Absolutos se noverint*, &c. given in a former note.

§ See Labbe. Concil. 4. Lateran. p. 71; and S. N. pages 5, 6, and 7.

|| *Ibid.*

First, does he continue to assert * “ that
 “ general Councils are infallible, in their doc-
 “ trinal decisions and canons, on points of faith
 “ and morals : and that Catholicks are obliged
 “ to adhere *implicitly* to such decrees ?”

Secondly, does he still acknowledge † “ the
 “ fourth Lateran, held anno 1215, to be a
 “ general Council ?”

Thirdly, did that Council claim, and exer-
 cise, the power of deposing a Sovereign on
 account of heresy, and absolving his subjects
 from their allegiance ? and did it solemnly
 decree that “ if a temporal lord neglect to pu-
 “ rify his territories from heresy, and, being
 “ thereupon excommunicated, do not give sa-
 “ tisfaction within a year, the Pope may de-
 “ clare *bis vassals absolved from their allegiance,*
 “ and give his dominions to Catholicks, to
 “ occupy, without being molested ?” ‡

A negative to any of these questions will
 suffice : § nor will total silence be without its
 use. It may preclude all future controversy,
 as to the candour of Doctor Troy. I am
 borne out by the maxims of our criminal law,
 when

* As he did, by pages 31, 32, and 72, of his Pastoral Instruction in 1793. See S. N. page 5.

† As he did by his Pastoral Instruction, above mention- ed ; page 32.

‡ See Labbe. Concil. 4. Lateran. p. 71 ; and S. N. pages 5, 6, and 7.

§ I do little more than renew a defiance, given by S. N. in 1793.—The challenge was not then accepted ; (for the answer which appeared, was unsatisfactory, and elusive,) perhaps the Doctor may be less recreant now.

when I pronounce—that if the accused stand mute, we may consider him as guilty.

If he admits the decisions, and infallibility of this Council, I would ask, how we can reconcile such doctrines with that obedience of Roman Catholics, to heretical or idolatrous superiors,—that loyalty in China, Turkey, and various Protestant states,—on which such stress is laid by their instructor? How otherwise, than by referring this allegiance to a manifest want of power to subvert the established system,—and a tacit, temporary, and *mere consequent* connivance of their church, at their “keeping faith with Hereticks,” or Pagans, while their submission does not operate “to the prejudice of the Catholic religion?” But in our mixed, and partly democratic constitution, where so much political power is entrusted to the people, it behoves the Catholics to abjure those tenets which I am imputing to Doctor Troy, more explicitly and satisfactorily than he has done. Else, they may compel us to remember, that with those who remain loyal, only while they continue powerless, every privilege which we confer, must displace a portion of allegiance.

My progress has now brought me to the *Notes*;^{*} and first, and shortly, as to that which adverts to my alledged (and perhaps actual) misconstruction, of the *Mandement* † issued in last July.

* On the Exhortation of 10th October, 1803.

† Dated Dublin, 24th July, 1803, and signed I. T. Troy. The following dialogue is somewhere stated to have passed,

July. I will leave that exhortation to speak for itself;* and if, when aided by the commentary which general councils, papal ordinances, and the exhorter's other Pastoral Instructions will supply, the reader shall interpret it differently from me, I acquiesce with pleasure in his liberal construction. Meantime, I am content that my tolerance should be measured by the sentiments contained in the foregoing letter; but should be sorry to estimate that of Doctor Troy. or of his flock, by the political doctrines which are to be found in his Exhortations,—or the persecutions which disgraced England in the reign of Mary,

or

passed, between a French bishop, of moderate capacity, and Piron. “Vous avez lu mon Mandement? Oui Monseigneur: et vous?” I do not remember what was his lordship's reply: but I wish, for the credit of Doctor Troy, he could answer all similar questions, in the negative.

* “You cannot forget our frequent exhortations to respect for all those, constituted by Divine Providence to govern us, so forcibly enjoined by our Redeemer and his Apostles, and *constantly* exemplified, in the submissive conduct of *all good Christians*, under every form of established government, whether administered by Infidel, Mahometan, or Christian rulers of any denomination.” (Therefore Wickliff, and the other *seditions* parents of our reformed religion *were not good Christians*.)

After distinguishing, not Protestantism from Infidelity, but George the third from sovereigns less liberal to their subjects, the Doctor, in another part of his Instructions, thus proceeds: “Be subject to higher powers; for there is no power, but from God:” &c. “wherefore, *be subject, of necessity*,” &c. Dr. Troy's Exhortation of 24th July 1803.

or this country during the savage Rebellion of 1798.

In another note,* (the last to which it is my intention to advert,) in farther proof that “charity towards all mankind, and an obedience to superiors, irreconcilable with rebellious maxims and designs, are amongst the tenets of the Roman Catholick church,” The Pastor gives us extracts from the Catechism which his religion teaches. On these I merely would remark, that I believe the doctrines of the Popish church inculcate every degree of obedience, to the mesne temporal prince, which is compatible with the interests of the Catholic faith, *and with the paramount allegiance due the Spiritual Sovereign*;—and that they teach charity to our neighbour, “*even him who injures, or differs from us in religion.*” But how can love for this latter, or charity to mankind, be better evinced, (by those who hold that out of their church there is no salvation,)—than by resorting to rigour however intolerant, in order to rescue heretics from perdition, and, at length, by bringing the incorrigible to the stake, to save, if not them, yet others, by so salutary an example? † But though I here close my comment

* To the Exhortation of 10th October 1803.

† “The Apostles, and their successors,” (says Dr. Troy, Past. Instruct. 1793, pages 60 and 67,) “have thought it their precise duty, in every age, to gain proselytes to this *one* faith, to this *one* society, to this *one* fold; and uniformly taught that salvation cannot be otherwise obtain-

“ ed.

ment on his extracts, I must beg to add a few myself.*

Q. Are all obliged to be of the true church?

A. They are.

Q. Why?

A. Because no one out of it can be saved.

Q. How do you call the true church?

A. The Roman Catholic church.

Q. Is there any other true church, besides the Roman Catholic church?

A. No. As there is but one true God, there can be but one true church.

Q. Are we obliged to keep the commandments of the church?

A. We are. "He that will not hear the church," (says Christ,) "let him be to thee as a Heathen."

Q. Has the Roman Catholick church the marks of the true church?

A. It has; and it alone.

Q. How is the Roman Catholick church one?

A. In all its members being obliged to believe, &c. and to be under the same visible head on earth.

Q. Who

ed. *Charity* impels the Catholics to bring the strayed sheep to the *one* only safe fold, in which they conceive themselves comprehended."—He asserts indeed, that Protestants also confine salvation to their own church: but these are assertions which are too bare faced.

* From (I believe) the same catechism, which Dr. Troy has cited. At all events from one now taught to Roman Catholics; and which was presented by the late Doctor Butler, titular Archbishop of Cashell, to a friend of mine, as a vindication of his church, from the charge of idolatrous worship.

Q. Who is the visible head ?

A. The Pope. He is Christ's Vicar on earth : the *supreme*, visible head of the church.

Q. To whom does the Pope succeed ?

A. To St. Peter, the first of the apostles, &c.

Q. Who made St. Peter Pope ?

A. Jesus Christ himself ; the invisible head.

Q. Can the Church fall into error ?

A. No : by no means.

Q. Which is the first commandment ?

A. I am the Lord, thy God : thou shalt have no other Gods but me.

Q. What are we forbidden, by this commandment ?

A. All sins against faith ; &c.

Q. Which are the ways a person sins against faith ?

A. By not believing what God has taught ; &c. &c.

Q. Who are they, who do not believe what God has taught ?

A. Hereticks, and infidels.

Thus, whatever Doctor Troy's exhortation may have done,—the Catechism to which he has refer'd, and from whose doctrines we may suppose he would not intentionally deviate, seems to class Protestants and Infidels under the same general head, of aliens to the faith, and transgressors of the first commandment. Neither do I see how, in theory, we can be prefer'd to Pagans, by one who

I,

would.

would, in this world, confute us by the stake; * and who, to all without the pale of his church, denounces indiscriminate, and unavoidable perdition. † It is true I am assuming that our religion is considered as heretical: a postulate which the Doctor may, but which I do not think he will, refuse. A religion which originated in “the *defection* of Henry VIII. from the see of Rome, and centre of Catholic unity,” ‡ and whose professors have been since “accumulating calumny and persecution” § on the meek and suffering “faithful,” || the Catholic divine is not likely to consider as “agreeing *in essentials*” with his most holy faith; and differing only in “*points of doubtful opinion*,” ¶
or

* For he admits the infallibility of the decisions of general councils; such as that of Constance, which appointed *burning* for the incorrigible followers of Wicliffe.

† “Catholicks are unanimous in asserting the doctrine of exclusive salvation, in the *one* true faith, and church.”

Past. Instruct. of 1793. p. 77.

“The Apostles, and their successors, in every age, have thought it their precise duty to gain proselytes to this *one* faith, to this *one* society, to this *one* fold; and uniformly taught that salvation cannot otherwise be obtained.”

Ibid. p. 60, 61.

‡ Dr. Troy’s Pastoral Instruction, of 26th Feb. 1793 page 15.

§ Ibid. p. 16.

|| Connaught Exhortation, and Dr. Troy’s Pastoral Instruction of 1793, page 32. and passim

¶ We learn from the Catechism, that the Roman Catholic church cannot err, nor consequently doubt.

or the mere "*forms of external worship.*"* And indeed, though I consider both religions as varieties, belonging to the sublime class of Christianity,—I must admit that their discrepancies strike myself as much more substantial and important, than seems by the above description to be implied. But the Doctor ought to go much farther. We, "who will not hear, nor keep the commandments of the Church," should, according to the injunctions of his catechism, "be to him as Heathens."

And indeed, let our titular Metropolitan be what he may, he is in many respects consistent with himself: as will appear by a collation of his recent letters, with those *Bulls*, which he addressed to the Roman Catholics in 1793. † I do not mean Pontifical, but Irish Bulls. Such, for instance, as the fallible infallibility of the Pope; ‡ and the position, that to *disclaim* an opinion, is neither to adopt, nor to *abjure* it. §

But I may be said to have misinterpreted this latter passage. For the credit of the writer, I hope that I have not: for, if it be not a *bull*, it is a gross and presumptuous *equivocation*; and would, in effect, put this language into the mouths of Roman Catho-

L 2

licks:

* The words printed in Italicks are taken from the form of prayer, appointed by our Church, for the 19th of October, 1803.

† Under the name of a Pastoral Instruction; and dated 26th Feb. 1793,

‡ Page 76.

§ Page 72.

licks: “ Heretical progeny of *Hufs* and
 “ *Wickliff*, we will not inform you whether
 “ we hold a certain opinion, highly dangerous
 “ to the security of a Protestant government.
 “ But thus much we may, with safety, ven-
 “ ture to divulge; that we are not *required* to
 “ maintain it, if we do not choose.”*

The Instructor is however, sufficiently com-
 municative of his own opinion: for in the
 midst of that cabalistical perplexity, which
 prevails throughout his work,—whose

“ True

* Here are the words. “ Many Catholicks contend that
 “ the Pope, when teaching the universal church, &c. is
 “ infallible. Others deny this. Without adopting or ab-
 “ juring either of the above recited *opinions*, which, while
 “ the church continues silent about them, are open to dis-
 “ cussion,—the Catholicks of Ireland have lately declared
 “ that it is not *an article of the Catholick faith*, nor are they
 “ *thereby required* to believe, or profess, that the Pope is in-
 “ fallible.” The Instruction adds, that “ the infallibility
 “ of the church *is* an article of Catholic faith; and that
 “ the decrees of a general council, or of the Pope, if even
 “ tacitly acquiesced in by the church, assembled or disper-
 “ ed, must be admitted to be exempt from error.”—Thus
 the declaration of the Irish Catholicks, as diluted by the
 Doctor’s interpretation, would merely be, “ We *must* be-
 “ lieve in the infallibility of the church: we *must* believe
 “ the decisions of a general council to be free from error:
 “ if tacitly acquiesced in by a majority of bishops, we *must*
 “ believe the decrees of his holiness to be infallible. But
 “ we *may* believe these to be, what many Catholicks con-
 “ tend they are, infallible, without the sanction of such
 “ assent; and whether such be our opinion, we beg to
 “ keep to ourselves.”—Truly satisfactory answers to the ap-
 prehensions of a Protestant government!

“ True no-meaning puzzles more than sense,”*

we yet can, with adequate evidence collect, † that he allows to the decisions of the Pope, an *at the least*—defeasible infallibility; to which the acquiescence of the Bishops sets the seal of incontrovertible and authenticated truth; and that in the interval of *centuries*, which may separate one general Council from another, he considers this Pontiff to hold the infallibility of the church in *commendam*; and his sovereign anathema to be final, and conclusive ‡.

To

* ‘ Aye Sir, the world is in its dotage, and yet the cosmogony, or creation of the world, has puzzled philosophers of all ages. What a medley of opinions have they not broached, upon the creation of the world? Sanconiathon, Manetho, Berofus, and Ocellus Lucanus, have all attempted it in vain. The latter has these words: *Anarchon ara kai atelutaisn to pan*; which imply that all things have neither beginning or end. Manetho also, who lived about the time of Nebuchadon-Affer, (Affer being a Syriac word, usually applied as a surname to the kings of this country, as Teglat Prael-Affer; Nabon-Affer;) he, I say, formed a conjecture equally absurd: for as we usually say *ek te biblion kubernetes*, which implies that books will never teach the world,—so he attempted to investigate,’ &c. &c.

The above jargon is no part of Dr. Troy’s Pastoral Instruction. It is to be found in a speech delivered to a member of the Protestant church, by a Lay Impostor, previously to defrauding him.

† From pages 73. 74. 75. 76. and other parts.

‡ In page 77, the Doctor seems to conceive that he has, in a reference to the principles of our constitution, discovered a most conclusive *argumentum ad absurdum*. But I apprehend that his opinion of the *provisional* infallibility, with which, in the long intervals between general councils, the

To return, his topicks, in these letters-patent of 1793, are perfectly similar to, if not the same with, those which we meet in the Exhortations, delivered in the present month, * and in July. There, as here, he enjoins his flock to imitate the example of the chosen people, who respecting their rulers, were obedient to Jeſabel, and prayed for the life of the impious and infidel Nebuchadonoſor: † who were loyal to that cruelleſt of tyrants, Nero; and avowed fidelity to thoſe governors who were ſhedding their blood ‡. On the allegiance of the Catholicks he there relies, with implicit confidence; ſince—ſlandered, reviled, perſecuted, and debaſed,—and groaning beneath the preſſure of unnatural and horrid laws, (to which for the purpoſes of conciliation, he adverts,) they have ever emulated the patience of thoſe early Chriſtians, who meekly endured the moſt bloody perſecutions; though in the words of Tertullian, they were numerous enough to retaliate, if they would §. There, as Seneca harangued

the Pope ſhould be inveſted, has more analogy with a rule which would not be ſtrictly conſtitutional; *viz.* that “the general council” of Parliament, “ſhould only be aſſembled on particular emergencies” (*a*) of the State; and that in the meantime, the Royal Proclamations ſhould have the force of law.

* October 1803.

† Page 10.

‡ Page 11.

§ Pages 12. 14. 16. 17. and alſo page 16 of a Paſtoral Addreſs, delivered by Dr. Troy, in 1797.

(*a*) Page 74.

rangued the despot Nero, he reads a lecture to Protestant kings, and ministers, on their duties: cautioning them against a violation of divine laws, fundamental principles, and natural rights. * There, he draws a parallel, between the adherence of primitive Christians to their faith, (in glorious opposition to the edicts of a pagan empire,) and the Irish Catholic's constancy, in rejecting the errors of our false religion; and illustrates their firm and laudable abhorrence of the Protestant schism, by comparing it with the refusal of Daniel to offer prayers to king Darius; or that of the youths of Babylon, to adore the image of Nebuchadonosor. † Still and stedfastly intent on the conciliatory plan, he suggests that freedom flourished, while Catholic the faith prevailed. That those were the days of the pious Edward, the great Alfred, and of the Barons whose public spirit procured us magna charta. But that when the sanguinary "tyrant, King " Henry VIII. (who never spared man in his " anger, or woman in his lust,) being con- " trouled by his spiritual father, in his criminal " pursuits, waged war against him, and *erec-* " *ed the standard of schism,*" (i. e. the banner of our religion,) "revolting against that faith, " of which" (all monster as he was), the vicar of Jesus Christ, "Pope Leo X. had not " hesitated to declare him lately the De- " fender,"—when this prodigious and black event

* Past. Instruct. of 1793, pages 20. 22.

† Pages 23. 24.

event occurred, the liberties of England immediately expired; and the birth of Protestantism and slavery, were coeval.* In short, the history of those times, when our heresy was “introduced, by this brutal and despotic prince, reminds him of the description which Tacitus has given, of the decrees and transactions of Tiberius, and the Roman Senate.”†

But this gloomy period of servility had an end. It ceased——(when think you reader?) “on the accession of the House of Stuart!” ‡ Meantime the flame of freedom was kept alive, amongst the Catholic Body in this country; § (and must be confessed to have shone, in 1641, with rather a lurid glare :) but, in the opinion of Doctor Troy, and a learned and benevolent gentleman, || (now, or lately, in confinement on charges of sedition, ¶) appeared most conspicuous, in the proceedings of King James’s Irish Parliament, in 1689: strongly illustrating “the solicitude of the Pastor’s flock, to establish the prosperity and independence of their country;”** but not, perhaps, setting in an equally strong light, their attachment to British connexion, or adherence to the free principles of that constitution, which had,

* Pages 26. 27. 28.

† Page 28.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid.

¶ In the Gaol of Cork.

** Page 28.

had, in the year before, * conferred upon the (shortly after) Dutch Invader, † the title to the crown of the British realms.

As to Protestants, crimes of the most opposite nature are incorporated and blended, in their polluted body. They not only, as in the persons of Henry VIII. and his successors, ‡ occasionally play the tyrant, and reduce a people to base subjection; but where “the frantic zeal of these innovators and reformers, to establish their religious tenets,” has stormed “that rampart, which the Catholic church opposes against schism, the peace of society is disturbed, and governments are overturned. § “If” indeed “the preachers of reform in Europe, during the sixteenth century, had been influenced by gospel principles, their progress might not have been disgraced, as it generally was, by tumult, warfare, and insurrection.” ||—But what marvel, if dissimilar and contrariant vices should unite, to defile that reprobate community, which “scatters, as it does not gather with the Pope; and which, as it does not belong to Christ, is Antichrist?” ¶ In short, which being “out of the church, can no more escape from perishing, than he,
M who

* 1688.

† So styled by Mr. Scully; *another Catholic Adviser.*

‡ Past. Instruct. of 1793, page 28.

§ Page 34.

|| Page 63.

¶ Page 33.

“ who was out of the ark of Noah, could
“ survive the deluge.” *

All this, perhaps, is very clear. But it may be questionable, whether the tendency of the Pastor's statements be conciliatory? whether they demonstrate that the Roman Catholics who embrace his opinions, are disposed to live peaceably with their Protestant fellow subjects? and consequently, whether such topics be adapted to an exhortation, whose professed object is to assuage exasperated minds,—and promote Christian charity, and constitutional allegiance? If they be consistent with the end and character of such a Sermon, we can only express our wonder and concern, that the discourses of 1793 and 1797 were followed by the treasons of 1798, and the present year; and that discarding the liege and essential character of their religion, † the Catholics should have abandoned loyalty, as an *hereditas jacens*, to Protestants, and even Orangemen: persons, whose conduct is in such opposition to the Christianity which they affect to profess, that the Doctor would scarce hesitate to pronounce them Infidels. ‡

But, if his doctrines and positions be at variance with his ostensible purpose, we can conceive that the excesses, which followed on their promulgation, should ensue—not in spite,

* Past. Instruct. of 1793, page 33. and motto from S. Cyprian, prefixed.

† According to Doctor Troy, essential.

‡ Past. Address of 1797, page 9.

spite, but on account, of such instructions; and that Rebellion should arise, not from neglect of, but attention to, the admonitions of chief pastors and clergy of his communion.*

I therefore wish, for the sake of a large portion of the inhabitants of Ireland, and in order to justify, if not a tolerance of their religious tenets, any support of their civil pretensions, that I might be permitted to acquiesce in the positions of a Protestant Writer, and Divine, which, Doctor Troy says, have been “ a thousand times repeated, by Infidel and “ Reformist Scoffers at Revelation;” and whose foulness, he fears, may “ thock his “ dearest brethren;” *viz.* that there are opinions, which belong not to the Catholic religion; but to its Hierarchy: or at least, that Popish individuals may be better than their tenets. † In short I wish not “ to judge “ of the civil principles of the body, by Ca- “ techisms, Episcopal letters, the decisions of “ Popes, or acts of general Councils;” ‡ but to suppose that, as “ there is one religion of the “ Irish state, and another of the Irish people,” § —so the duty of panegyrising such historians as Mr. Plowden, || and calumniating the Protestant population of Ireland, though it may

M 2

be

* Exhortation of October 1803, page 5.

† Past. Instruct. of 1793, page 59. and Exhortation of October 1803, page 7.

‡ Exhort. of 1793, page 101.

§ Ibid. page 99.

|| Ibid. page 74. note.

be held sacred by *some* amongst their dignified clergy, is not looked on in the same light, by the Catholic laity of our country.

Indeed, if the Exhorter be no better acquainted with the Catholic faith, than he seems to be with ours, it is no extravagant supposition, that the loyal and enlightened of his lay flock may hold a different religion; composed of tenets less unconstititutional, and dangerous than his. I advert to his ignorant and unwarrantable assertion, that we hold the reformed church to be the only gate of life; and deny the benefits of Divine mediation, to the pious but mistaken Christian. Such arrogant and uncharitable doctrines, we resign to churches, which make less allowance for the *fallibility* of man. Nay, conceiving myself to be a Protestant, *I* go still farther; and though I firmly believe that there can be no salvation, except through the inestimable merits of our Saviour, yet I will not presumptuously undertake to limit the extent, or efficacy of this mysterious propitiation. The Son of Man died to rescue the posterity of Adam, from the wrath of divine justice, and effects of original sin; and I trust that, compatibly with the arrangements of infinite goodness as well as wisdom, the same precious blood which washes out the deep transgressions of the Christian, may atone for the dark errors of the uninstructed Pagan; and that the Redeemer of mankind may successfully implore his *Father, to forgive* those poor infidels,

fidels, who *know not what they do*. These are my humble, but not uncharitable conjectures; which, on a subject so intricate, I utter with becoming deference to the doctrines of our church, and opinions of the many able divines, which it has produced. But I do not require the sanction of authority, for pronouncing, that though the discourses of Doctor Troy may deserve the title of Exhortations, it yet remains to be proved—that what they exhort to, is allegiance. Without inquiring whether the censures of Mr. Burke,* were justly incurred by the Sermon of Dr. Price, I can, without scruple, apply some of them to the discourses of Doctor Troy. Mr. Burke described that as “a very extraordinary, miscellaneous production, in which the moral and religious sentiments were mixed up with a sort of porridge, of various political opinions and reflections; but in which the merits of the Catholick faith and base conduct of the Protestants formed the grand ingredients of the Cauldron. He looked upon it as the public declaration of a man, much connected with political theologians and theological politicians; and chaunting his prophetick song, in exact unison with their designs. He thought this Sermon to be in a strain, which had not been heard or tolerated in any pulpits, since those days when the chapel rang with the privilege, and
“honour

* In his Reflections on the Revolution in France.

“ honour of the faints; who with the high
 “ praises of God in their mouths, and a two-
 “ edged sword in their hands, were to execute
 “ judgment and punishments on the Heathen.
 “ Few harangues from the pulpit appeared to
 “ him to have ever breathed less of the spirit
 “ of moderation, than this lecture did. Suppos-
 “ ing however, that something like modera-
 “ tion were visible in this political Sermon, yet
 “ politicks and the pulpit are terms that have
 “ little agreement. No found ought to be
 “ heard in the church, but the healing voice
 “ of Christian charity. The cause of civil li-
 “ berty, and civil government, gains as little
 “ as that of religion, by this confusion of du-
 “ ties. Those who quit their proper charac-
 “ ter, to assume what does not belong to them,
 “ are, for the greater part, ignorant both of
 “ the character they leave, and of the cha-
 “ racter they assume. Wholly unacquainted
 “ with the world, with which they are so fond
 “ of meddling, and inexperienced in all its
 “ affairs, on which they pronounce with so
 “ much confidence, they have nothing of po-
 “ liticks, but the passions they excite. Sure-
 “ ly the church is a place, where one day’s
 “ truce ought to be allowed to the dissensions,
 “ and animosities of mankind. This pulpit
 “ style had to him the air of a novelty, not
 “ wholly without danger.” Some of the to-
 picks in that discourse were only frivolous or
 absurd; “ but he might say of the preacher, *uti-*
 “ *nam nugis tota illa dedisset tempora sevitix!*

“ All

“ All things in the fulminating bull of this
 “ Arch-pontiff, were not of so innoxious a ten-
 “ dency. His doctrines” on the contrary, “ af-
 “ fected our constitution in its vital parts. The
 “ propagators of this political gospel were in
 “ hopes their abstract principles would for a
 “ while be overlooked. In the meantime the
 “ ears of their congregations would be gradu-
 “ ally habituated to them ; as if they were first
 “ principles, admitted without dispute. For
 “ the present, they would only operate as a
 “ theory, pickled in the preserving juices of
 “ pulpit eloquence ; and laid by for future use.
 “ *Condo et compono quæ mox depromere possim.*
 “ By this policy, whilst our government is
 “ soothed, its security, so far as opinion is se-
 “ curity, is taken away. Thus these politici-
 “ ans proceed ; whilst little notice is taken of
 “ their doctrines : but when they come to be
 “ examined, upon the plain meaning of their
 “ words, and direct tendency of their doctrines,
 “ then equivocations, and slippery construc-
 “ tions come into play.”

Asking pardon of my reader, for having been
 led, by the nature of those doctrines, which
 I was opposing, into more of religious discus-
 sion than may seem to become a Yeoman,
 (yet are we not involved in a sort of *defensive*
crusade, against the French?) I shall conclude
 by observing, that if I were to admonish, my
 language might be different from that of Doc-
 tor Troy ; but my exhortation would not be
less sincere. I might say, away with the vain
 distinctions

distinctions of Protestant or Catholick!—
 Irishmen—your country is in danger! Christians, your faith, in all its branches is assailed! Embrace and arm in its defence! Let every hand assist to push away in time, from that gulph, in which the freedom of the Continent is already swallowed. Bury those vile feuds, which have originated less in grievance than in passion, and misrepresentation. Invoke in concert, your common God,—to protect your common cause; and fight confidently, and cordially, for your altars and your firesides! Would I hesitate to shed my blood, in defending the life or freedom of a Catholic fellow subject? Not a moment! As I shall answer it on that day, which, considering our perils, I am aware may be at hand.—If I recollected his religion, the thought would but serve to animate my zeal;—and I should encounter danger with the *more* alacrity, when by doing so, I could prove that I knew him only as a countryman, and a brother. Away with cold and qualified incentives to allegiance! else, while we are balancing, the Gaul may cast his sword into the scale. All is at stake. Look round upon your families; and recollect how much is comprized within that *all*. The lives, the property, the independence, the chastity, the morals, the religion, of your wives, your relatives, your children. Can you expose those Innocents, whom you have doomed to life, to worse than French Dominion, to the perverting contagion of
 French

French profligacy and corruption? For you, my Catholic countrymen, in the midst of impending dangers, what a glorious opportunity is afforded you to seize, by joining, heart and hand, to annihilate an invading foe! Can you doubt that the same brave, and patriotic efforts, by which you secured the freedom of our menaced country, would give birth to a cordiality, which ages could not abate, and link you with the Protestant, in bonds of indissoluble kindness? Can you doubt that after a successful termination of the struggle,—our Legislature, with an enthusiasm of confidence and grateful feeling, would anticipate the brightest hopes, which you could warrantably form,—and that the same auspicious period would be transmitted to posterity, as the æra of Irish glory, and of Catholic exaltation, to the very utmost and most liberal point, compatible with the permanent security of the government, and reformed religion established by our laws?

N

ADVERTISE-

ADVERTISEMENT.

From the sale of three editions, it may be inferred that this Tract has been approved by the Loyalists of Ireland. Confiding in his honest and constitutional intentions, and notwithstanding the mediocrity of his talents, the Author ventured to expect that he would obtain their patronage; and is proud to say that he has not been disappointed. He expected no other countenance; and, with one distinguished exception, he has not been disappointed. But of this, hereafter. In the meantime, for the sake of others he may be sorry; but cannot for his own. He may ruminare, (and even call a loyal and spirited publick to reflect) on a sentiment, which he has seen expressed in a MS letter of Mr. Burke. "This is like to be effectual policy. I am sure it is honourable policy: and it is better to fail if fail we must, *in the paths of direct and manly, than of low and crooked wisdom.*"

The Author has neither the power, nor the right, of silencing *conjectures*, however strong as to his name. But thus much he may venture to assert; that any person who undertakes to pronounce *with certainty*, who he is guilty of a breach of confidence, or utters an untruth; and that to the former of these charges, *very few* can be liable, *indeed*.

N O T E S.



(A) Page 36. This explosion, of which in the recent nomenclature of Jacobinical Patois, the last new title is *the Thomas Street Dispute*, is the same which in hyperbolical terms, the author of *Curfory Remarks* calls that “burst
“ of Irish rebellion, and massacre of the chief
“ criminal Judge, which produced military
“ law, and the suspension of the Habeas
“ Corpus act.” Still under the influence of the same mistake, this author, in another place, describes the present to be a “crisis
“ of foreign danger, internal difficulty, and
“ Irish Rebellion.”—The plans and proclamations to which this *riot* gave occasion, furnish, I must admit, some excuses for the notion, embraced by the Remarker.

(B) Page 41. “I am not aware of more than
“ one case, in which” Mr. Scully’s friend and advocate, “Mr. Fox and his minority
“ could be considered as a possible admini-
“ stration; and that is the success of the in-
“ vasion, or some other great disaster, which
“ should lay us at the feet of France. He
“ might perhaps be the vice-president of the
“ Britannick Republick; but there is little
“ prospect

“ prospect of his ever being the Minister of
“ an English King.”

*Curfory remarks, on the state of parties in 1803.—Page 74.**

The writer does not proceed to form a conjecture, who, in such an event, would be commander of the forces.

I *repeat* my protest, against being understood to offer an opinion of the conduct of General Fox, with respect to the occurrences of the 23d of July. This conduct may have been blameable, laudable, or blameless,—for any thing I know to the contrary. I only know of those general orders, which for a time, (*most unintentionally*, no doubt,) deprived the Yeomanry of military assistance, towards their drilling; notwithstanding the *high respect*, which the General is conceived to have entertained, *and expressed*, for the Yeoman force. With regard to the disturbance, I have merely said that we seem indebted *somewhere*; and that it might be desirable to ascertain the quarter.

I have just seen † *Juverna's* letter to Mr. Cobbett; which is by no means deficient in talent, or asperity. The writer seems to have read mine to Mr. Wickham; and (perhaps allusively) declines “ to touch the feelings of
“ General Fox; by making his character the
“ subject

* *Of the general merits of the pamphlet which I have here cited, the truth of many of its statements, or fairness of its representations, I protest against being understood as pronouncing any opinion. It may contain charges, to which it is only the delicacy of Mr. Pitt, that forbids an answer.*

† This Pamphlet being at press.

“ subject of anonymous observation.” But it seems to me, that the feelings of the Lord Lieutenant were as well entitled, as those of the Commander of the forces, to be exempted from such criticism; and yet, on the description there given of his excellency, I do not choose to dwell. For my part, with respect to the occurrences of the 23d of July, I have nowhere charged the General with misconduct: but have, on the contrary admitted that, of the praise which is *somewhere* due, for the precautionary measures of that night, he may be entitled to *no* share. He may not have contributed to guard us against surprise, and prevent the assembling of more than three or four hundred armed rebels, in the heart of the metropolis. I would also remark that, as it is possible that the fault, or merit, lies not with the General, but in some other quarter,—so it might happen that *both* he *and* others were entitled to the praise, or blame. Accordingly I have not inculpated, or exculpated any. I have merely sought to rescue poor *Nobody* from a charge, which it seemed to me that *Somebody* should bear.

For the rest, I do not inquire whose province it was to prepare troops, or provide artillery men, or ammunition: and for the character of the gallant general, I entertain as much respect, as he has *expressed* for the gallant body, to which I have the honour to belong. After this, will his friends deny that I respect him highly?

There

There is much in Juverna's letter, from which I do not dissent; nor do I mean to dispute the ability or public spirit of the Writer; and should not have written even what I have, but for the purpose of vindicating myself, against the effects of a seeming allusion.

In his praise of Sir John Stewart, I heartily concur. I also agree with him, that none who read our papers, would suppose our press was free; and still less would learn from them, the true situation of the country, or system of measures for which that situation calls:—and I wish that a *loyal* and *independent* paper was (why is it not?) established; to meet the mean, cold, sedate artifices of the day,—to enforce adherence to the promised, and genuine principles of the Union,—to reach the ears, and break the slumbers of the Imperial Administration,—and preserve the freedom and constitution of our forgotten country. We have made advances, if not in policy, yet in police; and such a paper might be called

THE CONSERVATOR.

(C) Page 51. Considering the principles contained in the foregoing pages, I may here venture to confess the sorrow which I feel for the doom, though just and necessary, of those unhappy brothers. Their talents, and in some respects their amiable dispositions, if unperverted, might have led to a different and splendid lot. I might as a Juror consign them to the scaffold; or as a Ycoman meet them
in

in the field ; but I will never insult the calamities of the exile ; or traduce the memory of the defenceless dead. I knew the elder, (Thomas;) and my recollection of what I thought, both of his head and heart, is, spite of me, and of what followed, accompanied with an emotion of sympathy and sadness. Perhaps, if he had succeeded, I should have been amongst his victims : but if other reflections do not check my feelings, they shall not subside, before one so selfish, and dastardly as this.

In truth, it has been my lot to hear from others, (who yet have seemed the objects less of punishment than favour,) doctrines as seditious as any preached by Thomas Emmett. It is true that, in the crisis of 1796 (almost as serious a conjuncture as the present,) this latter resisting the entreaties of his friends, declined joining any corps of Yeomanry. It is, however, doing him but justice, to add that he never had belonged to one ; and therefore, cannot be accused of the less pardonable offence, of having suddenly withdrawn himself, in a moment of pressing danger.

'*A priori*, we should not suppose that to promulgate the doctrines of Republicanism, or Disaffection, would be the surest mode for gaining Ministerial countenance. But in the *latitude* of politicks, we may sometimes learn the variations of the practical needle, from theoretical polarity.

Many,

Many, (and even my humble self amongst the number,) if their principles would permit, could take this road to influence and respect. They could either hide themselves in a blinking silence, from the discussion of a decisive measure; and then tower above those whose firm probity was their only crime; or they could promulge the disloyal code, with boldness equalling, and talent (easily) exceeding, what any of the candidates for State honours may have displayed. It might seem ominous and severe, that loyalty should be found to be an impediment to advancement, and a forerunner of disgrace. I therefore rejoice that in this country, such anomalies are unseen.

Surely *bumbugging* is one of the most necessary arts of life. If he who is ignorant of it, be only laughed at, he escapes with singular good fortune.

(D) Page 54. Not by flattering individuals; but by serving Ireland. I am far from meaning to recommend a fawning prostration of the King's government to its opponents; or supercilious discountenance of those, from whom, in an arduous moment, the Empire received a principled support.

Still less would I be construed to insinuate, that if (as, among such a number of opponents, might occur,) the opposition of some were built on the avowal of principles substantially repugnant to the constitution, these should

should be selected as objects, rather of homage, than cultivation.

Such conduct would be more likely at the last, to let down the government, than to exalt the idols. I should therefore lament being so misinterpreted, as to be supposed to recommend it; and insert this note to obviate misconstruction. It was to *liege* opponents I adverted.

It is wise, to enlist ability in the service of the state; but would be a mistake, to suppose loyalty incompatible with talent. Besides, to distinguish this latter, may take time; and even require a small portion of discernment. The want of this might produce an awkward, and paradoxical phenomenon; viz. the disloyalty of a country in *seeming* array for Administration; and its sound ability drawn up against them. A practice obtained in the reign of Charles the second, (which the author of Hudibras has thought fit to notice,) of cultivating enemies with the most sedulous respect; and generously fighting loyalty, (though link'd to talents such as Butler's;) because they knew that, even under discountenance, it would continue firm. The reign of Charles was speedily followed by a revolution.

Published by R. E. MERCIER, No. 31,
Anglesea-street.

1. History of the origin of the Irish Yeomanry; with the disposition made by General Knox in 1799, when an Invasion was expected. By W. Richardson, D. D. Price one shilling.
2. A letter to a Roman Catholic Gentleman of Ireland, on Bonaparte's projected invasion. By Charles Butler, Esq. of Lincoln's-Inn. Price 6hd.
3. By the same Author, *Horæ Biblicæ*: being a connected series of Miscellaneous Notes on the Original Text, Early Versions, and Printed Editions of the Old and New Testaments. Third Edition. Price 3s. 9dh. in boards.
4. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, on Sunday 21st of August 1803; published at the desire of the Provost: by the Rev. Thomas Elrington, D. D. S. F. T. C. D. Price one shilling.
5. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, on Sunday 28th of August 1803; published at the desire of the Provost: by the Rev. Richard Graves, D. D. S. F. T. C. D. Price one shilling.
6. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity-College, Dublin, on Sunday 30th of October 1803; by the Rev. George Miller, D. D. F. T. C. D. Published at the request of the Students. Price one shilling.
7. An Essay on Military Law, and the Practice of Courts Martial; by Alexander Frazer, Esq. Judge Advocate D. of North Britain: Price 4s. 10hd. in boards.
8. Rules and Regulations for the Sword Exercise of the Cavalry, with 29 Plates; Price 6s. 6d. in boards.

